DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 183 066 HE 012 305

TITLE Black Colleges and Universities: An Essential Component of a Diverse System of Higher Education.
INSTITUTION National Advisory Committee on Black Higher Education and Black Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Sep 79
NOTE 115p.
AVAILABLE FROM National Advisory Committee on Black Higher Education and Black Colleges and Universities, Department of HEW, Washington, DC 20202

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Access to Education: Administrative Policy: *Black Colleges: *Black Students: College Integration: Educational Alternatives: Educational Opportunities: Educational Policy: *Equal Education: Government Role: Government School Relationship: Higher Education: Institutional Autonomy: Mergers: Minority Groups: Policy Formation: *Public Policy
IDENTIFIERS Diversity: Position Papers

ABSTRACT

The report is the second in a series geared to generating policy and focusing national attention on the participation of blacks in higher education. It explores the concept and practice of institutional diversification in the United States and the implications and benefits of diversity for blacks seeking postsecondary education. It is the committee's concern that predominantly black colleges be maintained rather than be merged into white institutions. The methods identified to maintain institutional diversity encompass many areas, including the needs to expand institutional options for students of differing abilities and socioeconomic levels, to insure institutional viability, and sustain educational environments historically responsive to particular racial and ethnic group needs. Possible state and federal policies are examined. Appended are lists of historically black colleges and newer predominantly black colleges, criteria for Carnegie classification of four-year institutions, and charts outlining federal financial obligations to historically black colleges (organized according to federal agency). A list of references is included. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED183066

Black Colleges and Universities: An Essential Component of a Diverse System of Higher Education

RMAT

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 012 305

National Advisory Committee on
Black Higher Education and
Black Colleges and Universities

September 1979

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON
BLACK HIGHER EDUCATION AND
BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20202

September 10, 1979

Honorable Patricia Roberts Harris
Secretary
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Washington, D.C. 20201

Dear Ms. Harris:

On behalf of the National Advisory Committee on Black Higher Education and Black Colleges and Universities, I am pleased to submit an interim report on the status of Blacks in higher education, Black Colleges and Universities: An Essential Component of a Diverse System of Higher Education.

This report emanates from concerns relating to the preservation of diversity in American higher education--a diversity which guarantees maximum access and options for all Americans. Historically Black colleges and universities have served as facilitators for equal educational opportunity in the past and continue that role today. The Committee feels that this role is of supreme importance to national priorities of universal access, and to the aspirations and goals of many low-income and disadvantaged students. With this in mind, recommendations for support and enhancement of these institutions are included along with appropriate measures and interventions for the Federal government.

We are grateful for the opportunity to stimulate national attention on the improvement of higher educational opportunities for Black Americans. It is our expectation that this report and recommendations will assist the Federal government in initiating and continuing those efforts for achieving this end.

Sincerely

Elias Blake Jr.

Elias Blake, Jr.
Chairperson

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON
BLACK HIGHER EDUCATION AND
BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20202

September 10, 1979

Honorable Mary Berry
Assistant Secretary for Education
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Washington, D.C.

Dear Dr. Berry:

On behalf of the National Advisory Committee on Black Higher Education and Black Colleges and Universities, I am pleased to submit an interim report on the status of Blacks in higher education, *Black Colleges and Universities: An Essential Component of a Diverse System of Higher Education*.

This report emanates from concerns relating to the preservation of diversity in American higher education--a diversity which guarantees maximum access and options for all Americans. Historically Black colleges and universities have served as facilitators for equal educational opportunity in the past and continue that role today. The Committee feels that this role is of supreme importance to national priorities of universal access, and to the aspirations and goals of many low-income and disadvantaged students. With this in mind, recommendations for support and enhancement of these institutions are included along with appropriate measures and interventions for the Federal government.

We are grateful for the opportunity to stimulate national attention on the improvement of higher educational opportunities for Black Americans. It is our expectation that this report and recommendations will assist the Federal government in initiating and continuing those efforts for achieving this end.

Sincerely

Elias Blake

Elias Blake, Jr.
Chairperson

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON
BLACK HIGHER EDUCATION AND
BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20202

September 10, 1979

Commissioner of Education
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D.C. 20202

Dear Commissioner:

On behalf of the National Advisory Committee on Black Higher Education and Black Colleges and Universities, I am pleased to submit an interim report on the status of Blacks in higher education, Black Colleges and Universities: An Essential Component of a Diverse System of Higher Education.

This report emanates from concerns relating to the preservation of diversity in American higher education--a diversity which guarantees maximum access and options for all Americans. Historically Black colleges and universities have served as facilitators for equal educational opportunity in the past and continue that role today. The Committee feels that this role is of supreme importance to national priorities of universal access, and to the aspirations and goals of many low-income and disadvantaged students. With this in mind, recommendations for support and enhancement of these institutions are included along with appropriate measures and interventions for the Federal government.

We are grateful for the opportunity to stimulate national attention on the improvement of higher educational opportunities for Black Americans. It is our expectation that this report and recommendations will assist the Federal government in initiating and continuing those efforts for achieving this end.

Sincerely

Elias Blake

Elias Blake, Jr.
Chairperson

The National Advisory Committee on Black Higher Education and Black Colleges and Universities was established in December 1976 to examine all approaches to the higher education of Black Americans as well as the historically Black colleges and Universities and then to make recommendations to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Assistant Secretary for Education, and the Commissioner of Education in 12 specific areas.

Although the Committee was established in December 1976, the Notice of Establishment was not published in the Federal Register until June 21, 1977, and the initial meeting was held in September 1977, nine months after it was established for a period of two years.

As required by its Charter, the membership consists of members knowledgeable about the higher education of Blacks, the historically Black colleges and universities, and the economic, educational, societal, and political realities in which public policy is made.

MEMBERSHIP

Dr. Elias Blake, Chairperson
President
Clark College
240 Chestnut Street, S.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30314

Dr. Laura Bornholdt
Vice President for Education
The Lilly Endowment, Inc.
2801 North Meridian Street
Indianapolis, Indiana 46208

Dr. William C. Brown
Director
Institute for Higher Educational
Opportunity
Southern Regional Education Board
130 6th Street, N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30313

Dr. Nolen M. Ellison
District Chancellor
Cuyahoga Community College
Cleveland, Ohio 44115

Dr. Luther H. Foster
President
Tuskegee Institute
Tuskegee Institute, Alabama 36088

Dr. Andrew Goodrich
Director, Educational Assistance
Program
Box 4383
University of Illinois
at Chicago Circle
Chicago, Illinois 60680

Dr. Bertha G. Holliday
Assistant Professor
George Peabody College
Campus Box 319
Nashville, Tennessee 37203

Dr. Charles A. Lyons
Chancellor
Fayetteville State University
Fayetteville, North Carolina 28301

Dr. Paul W. Murrill
Chancellor
Louisiana State University
at Baton Rouge
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803

Dr. Henry Ponder
President
Benedict College
Columbia, South Carolina 29204

Dr. Gloria Scott
Vice President
Clark College
240 Chestnut Street, S.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30314

Dr. Herman B. Smith, Jr.
Chancellor
The University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff
Pine Bluff, Arkansas 71601

Mrs. Cecile M. Springer*
Director, Contributions & Community Affairs
Westinghouse Electric Corporation
Westinghouse Building
Gateway Center
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15222

Dr. Kenneth Tollett
Director
Institute for the Study of
Educational Policy
Howard University - Dunbarton Campus
Washington, D.C. 20008

(One Vacancy)

---

*Mrs. Cecile M. Springer was appointed March 1979.

FOREWORD

The National Advisory Committee on Black Higher Education and Black Colleges and Universities was established by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in 1977 to advise and make recommendations to the Secretary, the Assistant Secretary for Education, and the Commissioner of Education on all aspects of the higher education of Black Americans. In undertaking this task, the Committee has approached its mandate by developing a Plan of Action which calls for the production of various reports highlighting the status of Blacks in higher education and offering recommendations based on the findings of those reports.

This report, Black Colleges and Universities: An Essential Component of a Diverse System of Higher Education, is the second in the series of Committee reports geared to generate policy and focus national attention on the participation of Blacks in higher education. The issues related to diversity of higher education institutions are many, therefore, this report cannot be considered the final word. However, it explores the concept and practice of institutional diversification in this country and the implications and resulting benefits of diversity for Blacks who seek a postsecondary education.

In this context, the Nation's historically Black colleges and universities are set forth as important components of the higher education structure to be utilized and preserved. Due to their irrefutable histories as institutions of equal educational opportunity, and their ongoing commitment to the production of Black graduates, it is the Committee's concern that they remain as strong and important alternatives to be kept alive for present and future generations of students.

This document complements the previous Committee report, Access of Black Americans to Higher Education: How Open Is The Door?, which documented representation and distribution of Blacks in higher education, and explored ways of increasing access. Although Black access has increased tremendously in recent years, to assume that Blacks now have ready access to the full benefits of higher education is to ignore the ramifications of a system which has not traditionally embraced the needs and aspirations of our Nation's largest minority group. In an era when greater access for Blacks has meant greater student diversity in our colleges and universities, uniformity in the institutions offering this access should not necessarily follow. Rather, a demand for pluralistic structures continues to exist to assure that the present and future needs of Black students are met.

The methods identified by the Committee to maintain institutional diversity encompass many areas of consideration. They include the need to expand institutional options for students of differing abilities and socioeconomic levels, to ensure the viability of institutions which have historically shown and continue to show a commitment to the educational opportunity of minority and low-income students, and to sustain educational environments responsive to particular racial and ethnic group needs. In focusing on these types of considerations, the Committee hopes to sensitize policy makers, researchers, and the general public to the assumed and requisite roles of special interest institutions, such as the historically Black colleges and universities, and highlight the realities facing these types of institutions presently and the years ahead.

This report is the result of the efforts of a number of people. Acknowledgements must be given to those staff people who worked diligently on the production of this report. The Committee is grateful to the Program Delegate, Carol Joy Smith, who supervised the Committee's staff in the successful completion of this report, along with other monumental tasks, under extremely adverse conditions; to Mae H. Carter, who typed many drafts of the report and the final copy; and to Charlotte Thompson and Jacqueline Meadows, who were responsible for much of the editing and final coordination of the report. The Committee extends its special appreciation to Glenda Partee-Scott, who synthesized the many recommendations of the Committee members and carried out the primary responsibility for the development and preparation of this report. Special thanks are due to Clifton Lambert for the design of the Committee's logo.

Elias Blake, Jr.
Chairman

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Foreword.. xi

Table of Contents... xiii

List of Tables.. xv

Executive Summary and Highlights............................ xvii

Part I : Introduction............................... 1

Part II : Historical Development of Diversity in U.S. Higher Education.................... 5

A. Diversity of Structures: Response to a Need............................. 5

B. Rise of Special Interest Institutions. 7

Part III : Role of Diversity in Expanding Opportunities of Access and Equity for Blacks in Higher Education............. 17

Part IV : Role of the Historically Black Colleges in Satisfying Black Higher Education Needs. 28

A. Student Characteristics............... 30

B. Curricula Offerings.................. 32

C. Faculty Characteristics............... 36

D. Aspects of Funding and Financing...... 41

Part V : Recommendations for Financing and Planning for Diversity..................... 49

A. State Policies Impacting Diversity.... 50

B. Federal Policies Impacting Diversity.. 56

Part VI : Summary and Conclusions.................... 72

References.. 75

Appendices..

A. Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBC's) and Newer Predominantly Black Colleges (NPBC's).................... 83

B. Criteria for Carnegie Classification for Four-Year Institutions................. 91

C. Federal Obligations to Historically Black Colleges............................ 93

LIST OF TABLES

Page

Table 1 - Black Enrollment as a Percent of Total Enrollment in Four-Year Institutions by Carnegie Classification, Fall 1976 20

Table 2 - Total and Black Undergraduate Enrollment in Four-Year Institutions by Carnegie Classification, and Type of Control, Fall 1976 21

Table 3 - Total and Black Undergraduate Enrollment in Four-Year Institutions by Carnegie Classification, Fall 1976 22

Table 4 - Four-Year Baccalaureate Completion Rate of the 1972 Graduating Class by Race and Institutional Type and Control 24

Table 5 - Majors Offered at Historically Black Colleges, Academic Years 1973 and 1978 33

Table 6 - Total Full-Time Faculty in HBC's by Race, 1975 37

Table 7 - Current Funds Revenues and Expenditures for HBC's, 1972-73 and 1974-75 43

Table 8 - Total and Per Student Revenue and Expenditures for UNCF Institutions, 1971-72 and 1974-75 44

Table 9 - Percent of Current Funds Revenues from Public Sources for 102 HBC's and All Colleges and Universities, 1974-75 46

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND HIGHLIGHTS

In line with the Committee's concern for increasing participation and opportunities for success for Black Americans in higher education is the necessity for maximizing the points of access and attainment. This goal requires that numerous portals to a higher education exist such that Black students have the opportunity to pursue the type of quality education they desire and in academic and vocational areas where they may realize optimum success. Only in this manner will the true benefits of a diversified system of higher education become a reality. Should systemic variables operating in our society such as racism, poverty, and poor secondary training serve to make some points of access unattainable, rigorous efforts to eliminate these barriers must be made. Additionally, insuring the existence of institutions whose primary commitment is to the advancement of equal educational opportunity must be guaranteed.

Diversity has historically been one of the more outstanding characteristics of postsecondary education in this country. It is through the embodiment of diverse institutions that the higher educational structure is able to extend its scope of curricula and services, attain high degrees of specialization and capability, and enlarge the population of college-going students to encompass a variety of culturally, socially, ethnically, and financially different students. It is through diversity that students are rendered the choices necessary in keeping with their abilities, needs, and aspirations.

For certain culturally and racially different groups, access to higher education and participation in its fullest benefits have been realized through the existence of special interest colleges -- the Catholic, women's, and historically Black colleges (HBC's), to name a few. The dissolution of traditional barriers which necessitated the origins of these colleges have not lessened their impact or raison d'etre. They may no longer be avenues of primary access to higher education for their traditional clientele. However, their roles in commitment to the educational attainment and progress of their respective groups remain unabated. They continue as insurance against barriers which restrict full opportunity and attainment while contributing to the rich fabric of American higher education.

For Black Americans, maintenance of the Black college sector is particularly crucial. Although Black Americans have benefited from wider access to all higher education in the 25 years since the Brown decision, the long-term benefits of integration are still questionable:

- The majority of Black students are enrolled in the two-year and less selective colleges while being underrepresented at the university level.

- Higher dropout rates are evident among Blacks in predominantly white colleges than Blacks in predominantly Black colleges.

- Systemic societal problems tend to restrict Black entry to postsecondary levels. Once admitted, many Black students are often underprepared and require special services which many institutions are not able to provide or choose not to provide.

- The commitment of modal institutions to low-income and minority students will remain a secondary commitment at best in light of other more characteristic roles these institutions play in the higher education community.

In as much as Blacks are often required to show greater proof of educational attainment in order to qualify for the same positions as whites, the educational advancement of Blacks cannot be left to chance. Additionally, neoconservative measures, such as the Bakke decision which ruled against special admissions programs for Blacks, impact Black access and threaten strides made in the area of educational and vocational attainment. It is essential that structures remain which guarantee the level of access and attainment required of the Black populace in the years ahead.

The unique history and role of the historically Black colleges must be understood within the context of diversity and the needs of Black students. The Committee stresses the following:

- HBC's, historically and presently, enroll a disproportionately large share of underprepared and economically disadvantaged students. This role has not been adequately appreciated or equitably compensated for in Federal financial aid and educational policies.

- Years of discriminatory funding, lack of Black representation in State legislatures and governing boards, and general neglect have affected the growth and development of many HBC's. Thus, their development is not always comparable to other institutions that have been allowed to flourish in a normal fashion.

- Traditionally, HBC's have not been recipients of broad sources of Federal funding. In recent years, primary funding has come from education and social agency sources within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

- Due to the difference in median income between Black and white families, lack of alumni financial support in development efforts often limits private sources of support.

- Curricula at HBC's have historically been restricted to fields and professions which Blacks could pursue or were directed to pursue in a segregated and racist society. With the lifting of many of these restraints, Black colleges have shown great flexibility and adaptability in preparing students for professions and opportunities in the Black community and the wider society.

- Blacks and Black colleges were recipients of de jure segregation and not active in instituting this practice. Where law allowed, Black colleges have not enforced barriers to equal educational opportunity to other race students, faculty and administrators.

- Despite the obstacles faced by the HBC's, their's is an outstanding record of accomplishment -- HBC's awarded 37 percent of baccalaureate degrees received by Blacks in 1975-1976; 24 percent of their graduates attend graduate and professional schools; a large proportion of the Black leadership in this country (elected officials, military officers, and other professionals) attended Black colleges.

The States and the Federal government have a long history of support and maintenance of diverse institutions. The origins of public higher education grew from the need to extend and expand relevant curricula and educational opportunity to a wider portion of the population. States have supported and continue to support private education where this sector augments the educational and manpower needs of the area. In that the Federal government is committed to the concept of universal access to higher education, the Committee stresses that institutions providing an affirmative action role for underrepresented groups directly support this policy.

So that Black students and communities may derive maximum benefit from a diverse cadre of institutions, recommendations are provided related to planning for the future role and healthy development of the historically Black colleges, and financing of the neediest students and institutions with the heaviest concentration of Blacks. A summary of these recommendations follows.

At the State level, recommendations are made which call for consideration of the unique histories of the HBC's and their present and potential role in the development of Black college graduates statewide. With respect to desegregation initiatives, efforts should be placed on enhancement of public Black institutions and expansion of equal educational opportunities for Blacks within the State.

At the Federal level, recommendations stress the need for greater sensitivity to the impact of financial aid policies on student distribution and on institutions serving disproportionately large numbers of needy students. Ways in which the HBC's can more fully participate in a variety of Federal grant programs while enhancing these institutions and expanding the educational opportunities for the students they characteristically serve are included. They involve: making certain programs such as the Office of Education's Title III program explicitly for the benefit of the

HBC's; ensuring that HBC's are given a fair opportunity to participate in Federal contract and grant awards; making HBC's sites for Federal research laboratories and programs; upgrading existing graduate and professional programs; and funding development efforts such as endowment fund building. So that HBC's may better continue their role in aiding the less prepared student to obtain a college degree, cost of education supplements are recommended. Additionally, so that the work of educating the less prepared and economically disadvantaged student is not deemed an inferior role within the higher education community, but is accorded its full worth, different criteria for institutional evaluation are suggested which recognize diverse approaches to managing student development and measuring institutional output.

I. INTRODUCTION

This report addresses issues related to diversity in American higher education and the relationship of diversity to maximizing the opportunities for Black Americans to engage in postsecondary education. The report emanates from a general concern over the quality and quantity of options available to students who seek a college education and the ability of the Nation's postsecondary institutions to respond to the needs of a diverse populace.

Specific concerns relate to the types of institutional options available to Black Americans and where they may realize optimum success in postsecondary education. Special focus is directed to the historically Black colleges (HBC's) because of their unique role, both traditionally and presently, in the education of Black students. Other colleges which educate a disproportionately high share of Black students assume a similar role, and should be considered where their needs and qualities parallel those of the HBC's. However, an indepth analysis of these institutions is beyond the scope of this paper. The report explores the historical evolution and status of diversity -- a diversity of institutional options, programs, cultural and social environments which must be preserved if realistic choices for all students are to be provided in the years ahead.

To meet the disparate needs of students, pluralistic structures have developed in the form of special interest colleges and universities. Institutions such as women's colleges, religious affiliated schools, selective and nonselective colleges, community colleges, proprietary schools, low-cost institutions, urban and rural-mission institutions, and historically Black colleges all work to provide options of universal access to higher education through the availability of diverse structures of postsecondary education. These types of institutions afford access to the modal and nonmodal student providing an education within the context of certain cultural, ethnic, and social supports. These institutions also provide the basis of the rich fabric of American higher education and the element of choice so important in a democratic society.

Concerns related to diversity surface in a period of great flux and complexity in higher education when stresses are evident among its component parts. Expansions undertaken in the mid 1960's and early 1970's, while college enrollments were increasing, are giving way to a period of retrenchment in the face of inflation and dwindling numbers of traditional college-going students. Large public institutions are in direct competition with smaller, private institutions for students and funds. The growth of low-cost and technical-oriented schools, while expanding opportunities for students, threaten the focus and livelihood of the older, more traditional schools. Desegregation in higher education has greatly changed the racial composition of many institutions forcing a reevaluation of old approaches to recruitment, curricula, student services, and supports. Desegregation has also had a far reaching impact on the historically Black institutions, whose role in higher education evolved out of exclusionary practices of access for minorities.

These are but a few of the issues forcing institutions to explore new roles and missions in an effort to tap newer more diverse groups of students, obtain varied sources of funds, and attempt other measures designed to ensure institutional health and resiliency. These measures are not without potential drawbacks as they alter the unique and historical missions of many institutions, forcing them to forego many features which contribute to their role in diversity. For example, religious affiliated institutions are of necessity dropping their denominational affiliations in anticipation of gaining wider sources of support. Social changes and models of living are forcing a redefinition of many institutions as they try to stay in step with massive changes in society. Many non-coeducational institutions have changed their admissions policies and in doing so jeopardized their unique qualities. Many State institutions which traditionally catered to the poorer and less prepared student and educated them in specific career areas are expanding their curricula and upgrading admissions standards in hopes of acquiring more prestige and designation as research universities. Widening differentials between the cost of public and private education give lower cost institutions a favorable advantage over higher cost institutions and impact the open market attributes of postsecondary education which make for expanded options in the types of institutions available to students. Fears of homogeniety of purpose and control, prospects of extinction or loss of special missions of many institutions, and charges that diversity fosters inefficiency and duplication, necessitate concerns for the future of diversity in American higher education.

Were diversity not to exist, and a more uniform system of higher education permitted to evolve, the resulting loss must be calculated. The presence of diversity not only assures student options but permits greater uses to which our Nation's educational resources can be applied in addressing changing national and international priorities. A range of capabilities and service missions inherent in pluralistic structures ensures flexibility, and responsiveness in times of national crisis and change.

The long-term benefits and costs of maintaining a diversified system must be weighed against the short-term benefits and costs of a more uniform system. Where the case can be made that diversity ensures the greatest number and highest quality of graduates, the need for maintenance of diversity is reinforced. Should the outcome of the forces presently interacting in higher education result in the demise of diversity, much of the innovation and egalitarian impetus of higher education will be lost. Additionally, as diversity promotes equal educational opportunity, it is important that institutions providing a wide range of access be maintained.

This report deals with the impact of diversity on access for groups traditionally underrepresented in higher education and for which acquisition of a higher degree is essential for social and economic mobility. Recommendations relate specifically to the future role and healthy development of the HBC's and ways they may fulfill their potential for expanding the numbers of Blacks enrolled in higher education nationally and regionally. Where applicable, these recommendations should be extended to other institutions with large concentrations of Black students.

II. HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF DIVERSITY IN U.S. HIGHER EDUCATION

This country's response to the postsecondary educational needs of a pluralistic populace was not to create uniform structures of higher education. Rather, the lack of centralized control of education, a strong sectarian influence, and national emergencies and manpower dictates combined to create a loose and diverse amalgam of postsecondary education structures.

At the base of this structure is the element of choice--choice for students and communities, as well as for institutions. Because higher education is deemed an option rather than a right or requisite, its component parts have been free to admit students along various prescribed guidelines, to promote their self-interests, and to promote certain curricula. This prerogative has permitted discrimination and denied access to certain segments of society. Fortunately, those denied access through existing channels have found other institutional options.

Where inflexibility, discrimination, and traditions militated against the access of certain groups, new institutions arose to counteract this posture and provide access to those otherwise denied a higher education. This imperfect method of development has resulted in the great diversity of educational structures we witness today. These pluralistic structures offer maximum opportunities of choice to students of differing preparational levels, ethnic cultures, aspirations, and educational and social interests. This section explores the historical and philosophical basis of diversity in American higher education.

A. Diversity of Structures: Response to a Need

The presence and continuation of diversified structures of higher education in this country stem from numerous causes. Some relate directly to the benefits accrued from institutional specialization and a resulting efficiency and quality of the educational process and outcome. In responding to the myriad training and educational needs of our populace, many types of institutions geared toward different capabilities and emphases are required.

The Federal government has recognized this capability inherent in a diversified system and has promoted the development of special purpose institutions where the existence of these structures is essential to the Nation's program needs and priorities. Congressional legislation created land-grant colleges and universities to promote research and training in commercial and agricultural areas (Morrill Acts of 1862 and 1890). Numerous Federal initiatives have successfully encouraged a postsecondary role in vocational training and have helped refine institutional role in this regard.* Federal support of research has helped create and sustain the specialized group of institutions identifiable as the research universities.* Repeatedly, the government has called upon the range of higher educational institutions to implement national programs and to solve many social, economic and manpower problems. In so doing, the government has expanded and supported the development of diversity.

---

*Smith Hughes Act of 1917; 1919 Vocational Rehabilitation Act; Vocational Education Act of 1963.

Other causes requiring a diversified system relate to the range of sectarian interests and philosophical orientations in our diverse populace, and the need of these interest groups to control and promote their special brand of education. The availability of diversity not only permits needed student options in choice of an institution, but allows institutions to specialize in courses of offering and in the types of educational experience offered. This option makes it possible for an institution to assume a special mission, be it to provide a mass, nonsecular education, a highly supportive liberal arts education, a nontraditional or alternative approach to education, or a religious environment. This option also permits institutions to develop a specific role and commitment to a particular student clientele.

A limited commitment to the development of particular student types does not necessarily preclude service to other groups, but it does permit institutions to excell in specialized areas and with certain types of students. Hence different types of institutions admit or have differential success with various types of students. For example, selective liberal arts colleges and doctoral-granting universities are least likely to enroll first-generation college students (Holstrom, 1976, p. 8). Their selective admissions policies and higher attendance costs often militate against attendance of the less wealthy,less prepared first-generation college student. Since four out of five of Black students are the first of their generation to attend college (Ibid), the limited options available to some groups in higher education become more evident.

Under the rubric of seeking a more equitable match between their mission/goals and student goals, higher education institutions have the option, and have successfully utilized this option, to delimit their services and clientele. The existence of mechnanisms to limit and prescribe admissions of certain types and groups of students either through policy, custom, cost, or type of curricula creates barriers to access for students for which a particular orientation does not apply. The need to expand limited options for student groups for which legal, social, cultural, educational or economic restraints exist also provides the historical, present, and continuing need for special interest institutions.

---

*In 1976, the Federal government provided $1.8 billion to universities for basic scientific research. This figure represented 70 percent of funds available to universities for this purpose. Without Federal funding, an adequate national program in basic science would not be possible (A Report from Fifteen University Presidents, 1977, p. 39).

These are the institutions created in response to exclusion and neglect of certain student groups. In terms of providing primary access to higher education for groups which have been neglected in other sectors, these institutions loom prominently in any rationale for the maintenance of diversity.

A recount of the history of higher education illustrates how and why a diversity based solely on curricula, level of offering, and type of control has not been sufficient in supplying the types of access routes and cultural supports necessary for all student groups and communities which postsecondary education must ultimately serve. Hence, a second set of institutions devoted to the specific needs of students in terms of other indicies such as sexual, religious, racial or socioeconomic status has been allowed to flourish.

B. Rise of Special Interest Institutions

The seed of higher education grew from the need of religious denominations to train their clergy and laity. Thus the colonial colleges were largely denominational affiliated, principally Protestant. Due to the paucity of higher educational institutions in the American colonies, these early institutions were not restrictive in admitting students of differing faiths; yet students were subject to the pervasive influence of the controlling religious educational environment. Even after independence of the Nation, infant State governments continued to rely largely on private institutions for the education of ministers, lawyers, and doctors.

State efforts to convert private institutions to State auspices were frustrated in the celebrated Dartmouth College decision. "This decision . . . provided effective barriers against advancing democratic forces pressuring for control of higher education and the alteration of conventional curriculum policies. Neither barrier endeared the colleges to the populace." (Brubacher and Rudy, 1968, p. 36) Although this case dampened State efforts to control existing private institutions, it provided the impetus for the development of State colleges thus making higher education more accessible and relevant to a broader scope of students. In spite of the emergence of public higher education, both public and private institutions represented primarily the wishes and interests of the older immigrant and Protestant stock.

The education of the poor, immigrant, and non-Protest populations has always created a dilemma for Americans and American higher education. The response to this dilemma was not always to expand access to existing institutions but to create new special mission institutions. The land-grant institutions which arose out of the Morrill Act of 1862 represented a concession to the children of farmers, merchants and the industrial class, as well as a response to the pressing agricultural and technical manpower needs of the country. The non-sectarian vocational colleges also responded to a need which the church-related colleges had no interest in satisfying. Social and economic upheavals which created awarenesses of "other" groups also gave rise to new and special types of institutions.

Education has been charged with obviating the differences among groups and acting as catalyst for the melting pot of the mass society. This has not been the typical role of postsecondary education which traditionally has been viewed as a luxury not a right, and is usually credited with enhancing differences between individuals. The higher education structure has traditionally served as a sieve through which those that passed were considered the "have's" and those that did not, became the "have nots". This further dicotomized the society. In this manner, those groups considered unacceptable were denied access, and in so doing, were relegated to the have-not status.

The great American dream has been to obtain entry to a higher education whereby the pains of assimilation and upward mobility were eased. Those groups most similar to the mode found easy acceptance into existing structures. If their numbers were concentrated enough, they could decisively affect the structure in terms of admissions policies, curricula, and the like. Those most dissimilar made little headway into existing institutions and either created their own institutions (if the cultural and community supports were strong enough), or institutions were created for them if their inclusion into existing institutions was viewed as reducing the quality or focus of the existing institution. This situation provides the origins of many special interest institutions.

Special interest colleges are of various types and derive their origins from differing circumstances and group needs. Institutions exist which were created voluntarily by certain groups to preserve their indigenous culture and beliefs, to combat undue influence of the dominant culture, or to train their clergy and laity. Many of the denominational and religiously distinctive colleges and universities fall within this category.

Religiously distinctive colleges such as Wheaton College, Illinois, of which Billy Graham is an alumnus, Bob Jones University, South Carolina, and Oral Roberts College, Oklahoma, are examples of institutions created to foster and preserve specific beliefs. Many of these colleges are nondenominational but "exhibit a pervasive religious character" (Keeton, 1971, p. 16) -- a character decisively at odds with State control and funding requisites. Nevertheless, at these "God first" colleges, parents can be assured of a specific evangelical Christian environment, one untainted by other religious and nonsecular influences. These colleges represent the element of choice to many nonminority students who could easily obtain entry to other public and private institutions but who for ideological differences seek a distinctive type of college education.

The Jewish special interest colleges such as the Talmudic Academies, Rabbinical Seminaries, Hebrew Teachers Colleges, and Colleges of Jewish Studies also exemplify institutions created to preserve religion and culture, and for training of religious personnel and laity. The Jewish community, however, has not had to rely totally on the Jewish educational structure as the primary vehicle for higher education attainment. This is because Jewish groups have experienced fewer obstacles of assimilation, have had their own political and power groups to counteract discrimination, and have been able to rely on the synagogue for supplementing their culture and offsetting the non-Jewish educational influences of the larger society.

Hence, many members of this religious/ethnic group desiring speedier paths of assimilation and preparation for general professions have sought out other educational options in public and private colleges devoid of strong Christian denominational leanings. Moreover, concentrations of Jews in certain locales have impacted the modal institutions to the extent that many now reflect the impact of this influence. Thus, comprehensive programs in Jewish studies can be found in non-Jewish institutions where large concentrations of Jews can be found. (Pilch, 1969, p. 174).* The Jewish special interest college is but one viable option among many for this ethnic and religious group.

In contrast to the higher education path pursued by Jews, Catholics centered their efforts on developing an extensive system of higher education. Although the Catholic institutions were founded principally for the same reasons as the early Protestant institutions -- to train the clergy and create an educated laity -- an underlying reason for Catholic higher education was to combat the overwhelming influence of the "nondenominational Protestant" common school where "Protestant versions of history were taught and Protestant translations of the Bible were read" (Greeley, 1969, p. 77).

Paralleling the development of Protestant and other modal institutions in the early stages of development, the earliest Catholic colleges were little more than high schools, reflecting the poor state of academic preparation of the newer immigrants. Thus, early Catholic education was special purpose in more than a religious sense. It offered access and appropriate curricula for the less prepared Catholic immigrants--an opportunity which was often unavailable in existing institutions.

According to Greeley, "There is both theoretical and empirical reason to believe that the separate Catholic education system actually facilitated the acculturation of the immigrant group into American society." (Ibid, p. 78) This was done not only through relevant curricula but through the creation of an occupational structure whereby Catholics could acquire mobility and status not then available in the wider community. The provision for a "separate status pyramid," though discussed by Greeley in terms of Catholic education gives further worth to the benefits of diversity of institutions and is applicable to other groups as well.

---

*Extensive Hebrew and other Jewish interest curricula can be obtained in major institutions as diverse as New York University, the City Colleges of New York, Temple University, Brandeis University, Wayne State, The University of California, Vanderbilt University, and the New School for Social Research to name a few.

As long as these institutions do for their special clientele that which is unavailable in the wider or modal community, or provide access otherwise denied, their reason for being is clear. Changes in the social class of Catholic Americans, eliminating the need for separate status pyramids, and changes in the posture of the Roman Catholic Church have led Greeley to openly question what it means to be a Catholic college in this day and time. Is it the fate of Catholic education to merge itself into the conforming spirit of American higher education in the same manner as middle-class Catholics have merged into American society? Or is there something intrinsically unique and valuable in a Catholic education? Greeley's book predates the new wave of Hispanic Catholic immigrants impacting higher education today. If Catholic higher education is sympathetic to the needs of this emerging group and continues to serve the needs of older Catholic groups, perhaps the mission of providing access and training for those denied and neglected in other institutions will be renewed.

Limited access to women, particularly on the eastern seaboard, and repressive notions of the type of education to be afforded women gave rise to the women's colleges. According to Boas (1935, p. 9), colleges were not for women because they were vocational training schools for professions not then open to women. The earliest seminaries for women could at best prepare women to become teachers and missionaries. The first colleges for women were radical in concept. Of the Seven Sister Ivy League institutions, Baker states, "Born in intellectual radicalism, the Seven overcame all manner of resistence in order to take women's education out of the female seminaries, where it had been essentially decorative, and to endow it with academic respectability." (1976, p. 2)

Now that women's colleges can no longer claim relevancy in response to exclusion, the driving force behind the origins of women's education has lessened. The women's movement of the 1970's has forced an acknowledgement of a female dominated educational environment as an important option to be kept alive in higher education. For the moment, the relevance of this distinctive sector is being reconsidered.

The relevance of women's colleges as well as religiously distinctive colleges represents group or special interest options which are important to possess but not absolutely necessary in that each special interest group can pursue other options in modal institutions. Although barriers to full participation in higher education for these groups have existed either through custom or practice, women and religious groups have not been legally and socially barred from mainstream institutions to the extent that nonwhite racial groups have been. Nor has sexism or religious intolerance ever approached the all pervading and destructive levels attained by racism in this country.

The fact that women and religious groups have tenaciously held onto their own higher education structures despite the near elimination of barriers which necessitated their origins speaks to the continuing need for institutions which vouchsafe a particular orientation controlled and dominated by the respective interest group. Without this element of control and dominance, these institutions would soon lose their particular emphasis and commitment to their respective groups in favor of other majority group interests.

The implications of this need take on added dimension when the historical plight of denial and neglect afforded the educational needs of Black Americans and other cultural, social and economic groups are considered. Since a higher education is so important to the ultimate life style earning capacity, and social status of an individual, access to higher education for these groups, cannot be left to chance. Rather, opportunities for access and success must be nurtured and maintained at every juncture.

The traditional avenue to higher education for Black Americans has been through the historically Black colleges.* These institutions, largely located in the Southern States where the bulk of Blacks originally resided, are living testaments to a restrictive and oppressive system of segregated higher education which left Blacks little option but to develop their own institutions. HBC's, along with the historically white Southern colleges, represent a diversity ascribed along racial lines.**

The existence of historically Black institutions parallels but does not necessarily duplicate the development of other special interest colleges. Black colleges like women's colleges grew out of social upheaveals resulting from the Civil War. HBC's, like the colleges originated for Catholics and other immigrant groups, were created in response to exclusionary practices and to pave the way for eventual assimilation into the dominant culture. For Blacks however, the HBC's represented the sole form of access to higher education in the South where legal and social restrictions were enforced and the only meaningful avenue to higher education nationally.

---

*"Historically Black Colleges (HBC's) are institutions that were founded primarily for Black Americans although their charters were in most cases not exclusionary. These are institutions serving or identified with service to Black Americans for at least two decades, with most being fifty to one hundred years old." (National Advisory Committee on Black Higher Education and Black Colleges and Universities, 1979, p. 13). See Appendix A for listing.

**The reader should remain mindful that a single race student body and faculty was the policy of Southern white institutions. Where law allowed, Black institutions never espoused this policy. Integrated faculties were the rule rather than the exception at private Black colleges.

Although most of the postsecondary institutions in existence today evolved from lowly beginnings, the development of the HBC's has been severely stunted by external pressures in our society. Owing to factors such as differential funding by State legislatures, lack of responsiveness and neglect by nonBlack interests in the wider society, and educational, social, economic, and political restraints leveled against Blacks generally, HBC's have experienced a chronological lag which has no parallel among other special purpose colleges.* Hence, in terms of historical development, HBC's like many of the sectarian and State institutions before them, followed a similar though delayed evolution of development in curricula and structure from high schools and academies to eventual collegiate status.

Thus, by the 1920's when public high schools for Blacks in the South made their belated entrance, and only then largely with the aid of philanthropic interests, the HBC's, through their respective academies, offered the few opportunities for secondary education for Blacks (Wright, in Jones, 1978, p. 6). Despite the burden of offering secondary and sometimes elementary preparation to Black students, the HBC's had produced an estimated 1,151 college graduates by 1895. The estimated number of 194 Blacks graduating from Northern colleges during the period from 1865 to 1895 pales in comparison (Dubois and Dill, 1910, pp. 48-49). Even today when desegregation and affirmative action in higher education have expanded options for Black students, the HBC's are holding strong as bulwalks of access to and attainment for Blacks in higher education. According to Southern Regional Education Board data for fall 1976, 41 percent of total Black enrollment is in 14 Southern States. Predominantly Black institutions enroll 43 percent of these students (1978, p. 8).

The level of development of HBC's -- a development which suffers in comparison with other special purpose institutions which have been permitted to progress in a more normal fashion -- should be viewed as a stage through which all institutions must go. HBC's are not lesser institutions because of this developmental lag; they have simply not been permitted to progress as have better situated mainstream institutions.

---

*Cases of discriminatory funding have long been factors in State dealings with Black public colleges. Payne (1970, p.5) compared State aid to predominantly white and Black colleges for FY 1968. He found that 16 predominantly white land-grant institutions received $450 million in State appropriations while their sister Black land-grant institutions received only $52.3 million. Although enrollment at the white institutions was only five and one-half times that of Black institutions, the white institutions received nine times the amount received by the Black colleges.

Black constituent representation has been conspicuously absent in State legislatures where policy and funding determinations for public institutions have been made. Blacks have only recently made headway into this important sphere of policy and determination of institutional support.

Private Black colleges continue to be plagued by inadequacies in funding due to the low socioeconomic status of students and alumni. See p. 47.

To questions put to the HBC's regarding redundancy and irrelevancy, the HBC's are particularly vulnerable when one considers the considerable overlap between them and other special purpose institutions. One can argue that access is available to Blacks in 1862 land-grant institutions, community colleges, private liberal arts institutions, and large public and private universities. This argument, however, does not consider the intrinsic worth of HBC's and the role that they have played and continue to play in the Black community and in the Nation.

Tollett ("Black Colleges Have Important Role to Play", October 9, 1979, p. 7) offers five arguments for promoting the traditionally Black colleges as:

- "credible models for aspiring blacks to emulate;
- "psycho-socially congenial settings in which blacks can develop;
- "transitional enclaves...from comparative isolation to mainstream without the demeaning competition or distraction of the majority white group;
- "insurance against a potentially declining interest in the education of black folks; and
- "economic and political resources for their surrounding communities."

These reasons parallel Greeley's "separate status pyramid" which served to catapult Catholics into the mainstream of society. This rationale illustrates the role that HBC's play as bastions of Black culture and thought -- much as the Jewish institutions do for Jewish culture. The HBC's and more recently, the newer predominantly Black colleges (NPBC's),* represent the few formal structures which nurture and stress racial ideology, pride and worth for Blacks. Consequently, they are what every racial and ethnic group is entitled to have-a political, social and intellectual haven. Had segregation not existed to create a demand for the Black colleges, their appearance would have still been warranted.

---

*Newer Predominantly Black Colleges (NPBC's) are institutions which, for the most part, have been recently established and were founded for the general population but because of their geographical location, are now predominantly Black. They are referred to as NPBC's to distinguish them from historically Black colleges. The determination of whether a college is considered a newer predominantly Black college...was based on their Fall 1976 total and full-time enrollments being more than 50 percent Black. Forty-two (42) institutions qualified as NPBC's in 1976 based on these criteria." (National Advisory Committee on Black Higher Education and Black Colleges and Universities, 1979, p. 13). See Appendix A for listing.

Institutions such as the HBC's and the newer predominantly Black institutions have as their primary missions, the education of minority and/or low income students. Patterns of enrollment for Black students indicate that HBC's and NPBC's are living up to these missions in educating a disproportionately large share of these groups.* Although other institutions can and do participate in this mission, it is not their primary mission. The flagship and elite institutions, as well as the more general purpose State schools, cannot stress this role over other more characteristic roles they may play in the educational community. At best, their level of commitment to minorities and low income students remains a secondary interest. Majority institutions such as Oberlin College which evidenced a commitment to the education of Blacks, women, and other disenfranchised groups prior to the Civil War and continues that commitment today are anomalies on the higher education scene. Special interest institutions alone are able to carry a special commitment to a particular group and on a scale of greatest effectiveness. This role takes on larger ramifications as it augments Federal educational policy aimed at providing access to the country's poor and minority populations.

HBC's have evidenced a continued responsiveness to Blacks and low-income students throughout their existence; this is not a new thrust. This responsiveness was more evident during the period of legal segregation in higher education. The need for this type of responsiveness will remain throughout desegregation of higher eduation. This responsiveness is unalterable, for it defines the very character of these institutions. It will remain constant throughout fluctuations in the desirability of having a Black or ethnic presence on campus as was the case in the late 60's and early 70's. It will remain constant despite neoconservative trends (e.g. Bakke)** which impact admissions policies aimed at expanding access for Blacks in postsecondary education. Recent Federal government efforts to desegregate public colleges will no doubt have great impact on the missions of public HBC's, but these efforts should only be geared toward strengthening this sector and should in no way deflect the historical purpose of these institutions' service to the Black community.

The development of diversity in postsecondary education is not static. Rather, the need for diversity is directly related to the changing needs of society, the changing pool of college-going students, and the

---

*For an indepth analyses of enrollment patterns of Blacks in higher education, the reader is referred to another National Advisory Committee on Black Higher Education and Black Colleges and Universities report, Access of Black Americans to Higher Education: How Open is the Door? 1979.

**Regents of the University of California v. Bakke needs of emerging groups which are left unmet by existing structures. Evidence of this dynamic process is seen in the continual rise of institutions committed to new and different philosophical orientations.

The social unrest of the 1960's, and a resurgence of ethnic values and presence gave rise to many ethnic dominated institutions and those committed to culturally pluralistic student environments. Like HBC's, these newer colleges perform an affirmative action role in creating educational opportunities where none existed before for the high-risk student and others on the fringes of the education structure. The missions and roles of these "new option" institutions are firmly implanted in the needs of their immediate communities and aimed at rectifying many of the social injustices experienced by their target groups.

Hall et al (1974) highlight many of the new colleges developed to serve the new student of the 1970's and 1980's. Pima College in Arizona which opened in 1970 is committed to a multicultural experience. Third College in California has as its purpose the educating of minority students (Black, Chicano, Indian, and Asian) and training them to assume leadership roles in their respective communities. The Navajo Community College begun in 1969 was originated to meet the special and unmet needs of the Navajo Nation. Nairobi College in California was conceived as "an alternative to an educational structure which serves many people badly and people of color not at all." (Egerton, in Hall, 1974, p. 110). Malcolm-King is a no-cost night college which caters primarily to working adults in New York City's Harlem community. The existence of these types of institutions illustrates the organic nature of diversity.

For minorities, low-income students, and others traditionally underrepresented in higher education, the presence of institutions which guarantee access and cater to the express needs of these groups must be encouraged. Further, an obligation exists to maintain these institutions in light of their productive roles not only in the educational community but in the wider society as well.

In the area of support and societal obligations for institutions which assume a special and needed role, distinction can be made between diversity for diversity's sake and a diversity which assures genuine access, educational opportunity, and production of graduates from groups which otherwise could not obtain this level of opportunity. Where special interest institutions work to effectuate these types of results, their existence should be assured in proportion to their benefit to the public interest.

Nationally, financial distress in the private sector is most evident among the weaker institutions characterized as the "invisible colleges" by Astin and Lee (1972) and the Liberal Arts II (See Appendix B) colleges of the Carnegie classification (Comptroller General, 1978, p. 22). Many of the private HBC's fall into these categories as do the private NPBC's. The public NPBC's, many of which are locally supported and two-year in nature, are circumscribed by their source of control, level of offerings, and fluctuations in their tax base. On the other hand, the newer option colleges as Johnnies-come-lately to the higher education scene, lack the clout, endowment, and alumni support necessary to ensure even a short-term existence. These concerns suggest the need for an overall plan to provide for the healthy development and viability of Black colleges and other institutions which enroll a disproportionately high share of minority and low-income students.

Only through aggressive efforts will the institutions which ensure the optimum number of opportunities for Blacks to obtain a higher education be maintained. Only through efforts to sustain special interest institutions which assure access and opportunity will the true benefits of diversity be evidenced.

III. ROLE OF DIVERSITY IN EXPANDING OPPORTUNITIES OF ACCESS AND EQUITY FOR BLACKS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Since 1965, minority and low-income groups have made great strides in access to a higher education. In the decade, 1966 to 1976, Black student enrollment increased 277 percent while white enrollments increased 51 percent. Blacks alone accounted for 45 percent of the enrollment increase in 1976 over 1975 levels (Mingle, 1978, p.-7). These increases have been largely attributable to the availability of Federal student financial aid and the lessening of barriers of discrimination for Blacks. These increases are accounted for in large part by the dramatic rise in Black enrollment at predominantly white institutions coupled with steady but lower growth rates at the HBC's. (Ibid, p. 6).

The phenomenal rise of two-year colleges has also impacted the growth of Blacks in postsecondary education. Between 1972 and 1976, total enrollments increased by 41 percent in this sector (USDHEW, NCES, Digest, 1978, p. 82). In 1976, 42 percent (429,000) of all Black students were enrolled in two-year colleges (USDHEW, NCES, Fall Enrollment, 1978; pp. 168-169) including half of all first-time Black freshmen (NACBHEBCU, Annual Report, 1978, p. 12). Hence, it is clear that the two-year colleges provide important points of access for Black students.

Access, however, cannot be viewed in a vacuum. It must be considered in concert with representation, participation, retention and barriers when determining the overall level of equity for Blacks in higher education. Barriers, however, still exist which often limit the opportunities for access and attainment for Blacks and low-income groups:

- The probility of attending college is still positively correlated with family income. Although the proportion of students from families with higher incomes ($15,000 and over) has been decreasing since 1967 (68.3 percent in 1967 vs. 58.2 percent in 1976), the proportion of students from families in the lowest income stratum (less than $5,000) has stayed much the same (20.0 percent in 1967 vs. 22.4 percent in 1976). (U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census, February, 1978).

- Although Blacks comprise 11.5 percent of the general population, they represent 14 percent of the traditional college-age group of 18 to 24 year olds, however, only 12 percent of this age cohort attend college. (U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census, March 1978).

- On the graduate and professional levels, Blacks represented only 5.1 percent and 4.5 percent respectively, of all students in 1976. (National Advisory Committee on Black Higher Education and Black Colleges and Universities, 1978, p. 21).

- Where 30 of every 100 white freshmen complete four years of college, only 17 of 100 Black freshmen go on to complete four years of college. (College Board, 1979)

Findings such as these have prompted questions regarding how we go beyond access to ensure equality of educational opportunity. Where minority and low-income students evidence high dropout rates and experience alienation, mere access represents an empty gesture.

Hall et al (1974) recommend new educational contents and formats as exemplified by the new colleges geared to the needs of new students as one solution to pressing beyond the access goal. Another solution lies in enhancing existing institutions with proven track records in this area and in success with the minority or nontraditional student. Holstrom (1976) suggests that we stop talking about students in the aggregate and begin concentrating on how institutional diversity affects and relates to students.

With this in mind, the important questions are: What types of institutions are most successful in satisfying student and national affirmative action goals? and why? Once identification of these institutions is made, national and local efforts should be channeled into helping these institutions most completely satisfy these goals. In addition to ensuring access for the groups which have not attained equity in higher education, representation and participation must be ensured.

As diversity amplifies the opportunities for access, representation, and participation, while eliminating barriers, it should be used as a decisive tool for achieving access and beyond. Moreover, Federal, State and local policies should be reviewed in light of their differential impact on the elements of diversity.

Following is an analysis of Black representation in higher education institutions. The purpose of this analysis is to more accurately pinpoint the ways that diverse institutions facilitate or fail to facilitate equity issues for Blacks in higher education.

Black Representation in Colleges and Universities

Access to higher education and degree completion are extremely important for Black Americans since traditionally Blacks have been required to show proof of higher formal educational attainment than whites to obtain the same goals (Kopan and Walberg, 1974, p. 2). Thus the more accessible the system is to Blacks and the more pluralistic the structures, the greater the chances for success not only in college but in later life.

Prior to efforts to desegregate education, Blacks were primarily clustered in the HBC's. With the advent of affirmative action and Federal financial aid, Blacks have obtained greater opportunities to attend a variety of institutions. Black representation, however, is not evenly distributed across the major types of postsecondary structures.

In evaluating Black representation and participation, the Carnegie rather than the U.S. Office of Education's classification of institutions allows for greater differentiation among types of institutions (See Appendix B for criteria for four-year institutions). Moreover, since institutions are arrayed on the basis of criteria such as Federal financial support of academic science, production of master's and Ph.D's, number of fields of graduate offerings, and level of student selectivety, it is possible to ascertain more fully the opportunities either available or unavailable to Blacks in various structures. Data derived based solely on the 1,361 four-year institutions in the classification indicate wide discrepancies in level of Black undergraduate enrollment.

As shown in Table I, the largest number of Blacks in four-year institutions are in the Comprehensive Universities and Colleges. Institutions in this category enroll 61.6 percent of all Black undergraduates at the four-year level, whereas the Doctorate-Granting institutions enroll slightly over one-fourth of Black four-year college undergraduates (26.2 percent), and Liberal Arts institutions, 12.1 percent.

The proportion that Blacks represent of all students within the Comprehensive institutions, 11.4 percent, approaches the same proportion of Blacks within the general population (Tables 2 and 3). However, ranges in percent of representation are noted between public and private institutions in the main category, and levels of institutions within the subcategories of Comprehensive institutions. For example, Black representation is higher in the public institutions (12.2 percent) than in the private institutions (8.9 percent). In the Level I schools, Black representation is 10.7 percent while in the Level II schools, it is 14.6 percent.

Comprehensive institutions are characterized by their liberal arts curricula, highest offering of the master's degree, and limited professional offerings. Level II institutions in this category differ from Level I institutions in having smaller enrollments and more limited graduate and professional programs. The skewed pattern of Black representation in the Comprehensive institutions category is also evident in the Doctoral-Granting and Liberal Arts categories. That is, higher levels of Black representation are consistently found in the less selective and less developed institutions of each category of institutions.

Within the Liberal Arts institutions, Black representation is 11.6 percent. However the Liberal Arts I colleges have only 6.5 percent Black enrollment where the Liberal Arts II colleges have percentages of enrollment which are approximately twice as high (13.9 percent).

The Liberal Arts I Colleges are classified by their high student selectivity and by the number of their graduates obtaining Ph.D's at the 40 leading doctoral-granting institutions. Thus, they are prestigious feeder schools to the larger universities on the graduate and professional levels. The Liberal Arts II colleges, where the greater numbers of Blacks are found, cannot boast these characteristics.

TABLE 1: BLACK ENROLLMENT AS PERCENT OF TOTAL ENROLLMENT IN FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS BY CARNEGIE CLASSIFICATION, FALL 1976

Institutional Classification	Black Enrollment	Percent of all Blacks in Four-Year Institutions
Doctorate Granting Institutions		
Research Universities I	30,100	6.79
Research Universities II	34,874	7.86
Doctorate-Granting I	34,529	7.79
Doctorate-Granting II	16,845	3.80
Subtotal	116,348	26.23
Comprehensive Universities and Colleges		
Comp. Univ. & Colleges I	209,296	47.19
Comp. Univ. & Colleges II	63,995	14.43
Subtotal	273,291	61.62
Liberal Arts Colleges		
Liberal Arts I	9,102	2.05
Liberal Arts II	47,774	10.10
Subtotal	53,876	12.15
GRAND TOTAL	443,515	100.00

Source: National Advisory Committee on Black Higher Education and Black Colleges and Universities staff analysis of data from USDHEW, Office of Civil Rights, Racial, Ethnic and Sex Enrollment for Institutions of Higher Education, Fall 1976, 1978. Classification from Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, A Classification of Institutions of Higher Education, 1976.

TABLE 2: TOTAL AND BLACK UNDERGRADUATE ENROLLMENT IN FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS, BY CARNEGIE CLASSIFICATION, AND TYPE OF CONTROL, FALL 1976

			Black	
Type of Institution and Control	N	Total	Number	Percent
Doctoral-Granting Institutions, Total	184	2,047,021	116,348	5.6
Public	119	1,682,636	89,747	5.3
Private	65	364,385	26,601	7.3
Comprehensive Universities and Colleges, Total	594	2,388,996	273,291	11.4
Public	354	1,815,166	222,171	12.2
Private	240	573,830	51,120	8.9
Liberal Arts Colleges, Total	583	461,578	53,876	11.6
Public	11	15,724	2,429	15.4
Private	572	445,854	51,447	11.5
GRAND TOTAL	1,361	4,897,595	443,515	9.0

Source: National Advisory Committee on Black Higher Education and Black Colleges and Universities staff analysis of data from USDHEW, Office of Civil Rights, *Racial, Ethnic and Sex Enrollment for Institutions of Higher Education, Fall 1976*, 1978. Classification from Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, *A Classification of Institutions of Higher Education*, 1976.

TABLE 3: TOTAL AND BLACK UNDERGRADUATE ENROLLMENT IN FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS BY CARNEGIE CALSSIFICATION, FALL 1976

Control Institution-Classification	N	Total Enrollment	Black	
			Number	Percent
Doctorate-Granting Institutions				
Public Research Universities I	29	640,312	21,692	3.38
Private Research Universities I	22	127,358	8,408	6.60
Subtotal	51	767,670	30,100	3.92
Public Research Universities II	33	399,783	26,263	6.57
Private Research Universities II	14	66,131	8,611	13.02
Subtotal	47	465,914	34,874	7.49
Public Doctorate-Granting I	38	445,609	27,542	6.18
Private Doctorate-Granting I	18	131,784	6,987	5.30
Subtotal	56	577,393	34,529	5.98
Public Doctorate-Granting II	19	196,932	14,250	7.24
Private Doctorate-Granting II	11	39,112	2,595	6.63
Subtotal	30	236,044	16,845	7.14
Total: All Doctorate Granting Institutions	184	2,047,021	116,348	5.68
Comprehensive Universities & Colleges				
Public Comp. Univ. & Colleges I	250	1,567,162	180,640	11.53
Private Comp. Univ. & Colleges I	131	384,608	28,656	7.51
Subtotal	381	1,951,770	209,296	10.72
Public Comp. Univ. & Colleges II	104	248,004	41,531	16.75
Private Comp. Univ. & Colleges II	109	189,222	22,464	11.87
Subtotal	213	437,226	63,995	14.64
Total: All Comp. Univ. & Colleges	594	2,388,996	273,291	11.44
Liberal Arts Colleges				
Private Liberal Arts I	123	139,107	9,102	6.54
Public Liberal Arts II	11	15,724	2,429	15.45
Private Liberal Arts II	449	306,747	42,345	13.80
Subtotal	460	322,471	44,774	13.88
Total: All Liberal Arts Colleges	583	461,578	53,876	11.67
GRAND TOTAL	1,361	4,897,595	443,515	9.00

Source: National Advisory Committee on Black Higher Education and Black Colleges and Universities staff analysis of data from USDHEW, Office of Civil Rights, Racial, Ethnic and Sex Enrollment for Institutions of Higher Education, Fall 1976, 1978. Classification from Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, A Classification of Institutions of Higher Education, 1976.

Within all the Doctoral-Granting institutions (includes Research Universities I and II and Doctoral-Granting institutions I and II), Black percent of enrollment is 5.6. Black percent of representation is lowest in the Research Universities I (3.9) which obtain the highest levels of Federal financial support for academic science and grant the most numbers of Ph.D's per year. Limited Black participation in all subcategories of Doctoral-Granting* institutions reflects limited opportunities for Blacks to engage in academic and professional pursuits in institutions offering the greatest range of course and degree options, and to benefit from activities associated with strong research and development (R&D) emphases.

These data underscore the fact that Blacks are not evenly distributed across the full spectrum of four-year institutions. Further, due to this uneven distribution, equal opportunity to participate in the total benefits of higher education is absent. The patterns of this distribution are no doubt affected by barriers to attendance such as cost, stringent admissions policies, academic preparation, and other social and cultural factors. These factors not only affect access, but retention and timely degree completion as well, and necessitate concerns over the impact of various types of institutions on Black attainment.

In a study of four-year baccalaureate completion rates for the 1972 graduating class, Holstrom and Knepper document differential rates for Black and white students (see Table 4). For Blacks as well as whites, chances for timely baccalaureate completion are enhanced by attending a private institution. For Blacks, the odds of four-year completion are significantly greater at private institutions. If the institutions are both private and select (as in the case of research universities and elite liberal arts schools), completion rates for Blacks rival or surpass those for white students.

These findings, though encouraging, do not necessarily apply to the areas where the greatest numbers of Blacks are enrolled in postsecondary education. The majority of Black students in four-year institutions are in public institutions. Moreover, the largest numbers of Black students, and students from families earning less than $10,000, are actually found in the

---

*The higher percent of Black enrollment in private Research Universities II (13 percent) is directly attributable to the inclusion of predominantly Black Howard University in this subcategory. If the Howard's undergraduate enrollment were disaggregated from the total for Black students in the subcategory, the resulting percent of Black enrollment for private Research Universities II would be 5.3 percent.

TABLE 4: FOUR-YEAR BACCALAUREATE COMPLETION RATE OF THE 1972 GRADUATING CLASS BY RACE AND INSTITUTIONAL TYPE AND CONTROL (in percent)

Institutional Classification	Black		White	
	Public	Private	Public	Private
Research Universities I	43.4	73.0	56.4	83.5
Research Universities II	41.3	80.4	57.9	73.8
Doctorate-Granting Universities I	46.3	47.6	54.8	52.1
Doctorate-Granting Universities II	24.1	46.9	56.7	68.6
Comprehensive Colleges and Universities I	45.9	43.8	56.6	67.2
Comprehensive Colleges and Universities II	54.9	71.7	65.4	71.8
Liberal Arts Colleges I	50.4	70.3	60.6	76.0
Liberal Arts Colleges II	--	65.9	34.5	61.4

Source: Engin I. Holstrom and Paula R. Knepper, Four-Year Baccalaureate Completion Rates: A Limited Comparison of Student Success in Private and Public Four-Year Colleges and Universities, pp. 31 and 33.

two-year colleges and the less selective four-year colleges (Bisconti, 1978). Thus, when the benefits of diversity for Blacks are considered, one must be mindful that meaningful access and participation are only evident in limited segments of the higher education community. Black and low-income student access to the highest rungs of the hierarchy (those institutions with the largest Federal funds for academic science and R&D, and breath of degree offerings) appear to be successfully constricted and the status quo maintained.

The rise of two-year public institutions offers new options in higher education to many students who for financial or academic reasons are not readily admissable to four-year institutions. Critics of the two-year public college system (Zwerling, 1976, p. 49) indicate that the origins of most two-year colleges were prompted not in the interest of expanding higher education opportunities, but to relieve the universities of the education of the less desirable non-traditional students and curricula.

This type of thinking gave rise to the three-tiered public system of higher education (universities, State colleges, and community/junior colleges) in States such as California where 15 percent of high school graduates are eligible for the universities, half are eligible for the State colleges, and the remainder are shunted into the two-year and vocational institutions. Though provision for diversified State systems such as this may be expedient in relieving the universities and elite institutions of the responsibilities of educating the less traditional student, this policy has the effect of structuring postsecondary education along socio-economic and racial lines. Moreover, this policy has a double-barrel approach in relegating students with the most academic and social disadvantages and cultural differences to areas of higher education with the fewest resources and programs which would ensure not only success in college, but social and economic mobility as well.

In a 1972 survey, Astin (1975, p. 111) found that the two-year sector had the highest dropout rate (mean of 59 percent) of all types of institutions surveyed with higher rates (65 percent) for colleges located in the West and Southwest. Additionally, Holstrom and Bisconti (1974) found that among 1,968 two-year college entrants, approximately half did not transfer to four-year institutions despite the fact that 57 percent of the nontransfer group had initially aspired to a baccalaureate degree. Due to the nature of their charge--to accept any high school graduate regardless of academic ability, socio-economic status, or level of aspiration, and to attempt to rectify inequalities in postsecondary education preparation, two-year public colleges shoulder an especially heavy burden. This is a burden uncommon to the majority of four-year institutions, but not uncommon to the HBC's, the "newer option" colleges, and less prestigeous four-year institutions.

The characteristics of the two-year public sector which make it an attractive vehicle of access to the minority and non-traditional student actually militate against attainment in a formal sense. Available options for part-time, non-degree credit study often limit timely degree-completion and the accrual of credits transferable toward four-year degrees. Also, there exists the possibility that groups for which attainment in higher education is most crucial will be channeled into terminal and vocational programs and denied the expanded options available in four-year institutions as well as the increased earning potential which a baccalaureate offers.* For these reasons, the drawbacks of two-year institutions and their impact on Blacks in higher education should remain a high concern.

A comprehensive analysis of the impact of two-year institutions on Black access and attainment is beyond the scope of this paper and will be fully explored in a subsequent National Advisory Committee on Black Higher Education and Black Colleges and Universities publication. Nevertheless, several realizations ring clear. Unless, two-year colleges represent realistic options to low-income and minority students, both in terms of preparation for meaningful vocations and as stepping stones to higher degrees, they can only be viewed as detours or dead ends for the large numbers of Black students who matriculate therein.

To avoid this designation means greater articulation between the components of the postsecondary community in going beyond mere access to assure equitable representation and participation for Black, low-income, and non-traditional students at all levels. It also means reversing some disturbing trends in two-year colleges related to attrition, two-year to four-year transfer rates, and degrees earned.**

In contrast to the concerns related to the two-year sector, the HBC's, the majority of which are four-year schools, provide Black students access to a more traditional and formal higher education. Data also indicate that they are high producers of Black graduates and students continuing past the baccalaureate. With respect to HBC impact on Black student retention, data indicate success in this area. Astin (1975, p. 26) found similar dropout rates for white men, white women, and Blacks in Black colleges (26, 23, and 26 percent, respectively). Dropout rates for Blacks in white colleges were substantially higher (37 percent). "The higher attrition rate appears to be attributable in part to the effect of attending a white college, rather than to differences in initial dropout-proneness between blacks in white colleges and blacks in black colleges." (Ibid) Hence, the differential success of white colleges and Black colleges in retention of Black students becomes evident. The enhancement of Black institutions particularly in terms of graduate and professional offerings would ensure greater levels of Black participation and attainment at the higher degree levels.

---

*The difference in earnings of college graduates and less than college graduates is well documented. According to Bowles and Gintis (1976, p. 217), the expected life time income of college graduates exceeds that of high school graduates by 50 percent. For those with some college, but less than a four-year degree, the advantage over high school graduates is only 14 percent.

**Despite the high enrollment rates of Blacks in two-year institutions, Blacks represented 8.4 percent of all associate degrees (or other awards below the baccalaureate) in 1975-76. Only 58 percent of these awards were chiefly creditable toward a baccalaureate degree (NACBHEBCU, 1978, p. 22).

Until systemic problems barring Blacks from full representation and equitable distribution throughout all higher education are remedied, focus should be directed toward ways that Blacks can most successfully impact the system through existing and sympathetic structures. Sympathetic structures can be defined as those institutions most responsive to Blacks presently and historically. The corollary to this approach would be to enhance these institutions in ways such that they can provide the quality and diversity of curricula afforded students in the more prestigious schools, and provide appropriate ladders of advancement to graduate and professional level studies. This approach is not to distract from the affirmative action efforts of the modal institutions or the demonstrated role played by the two-year colleges in expanding access for Blacks. All approaches must be continued simultaneously. But where the present speed and level of production of Black graduates are not adequate to ensure the goals of parity and equity, it makes sense to utilize institutions with proven records of access and success with Black and low-income students.

IV. ROLE OF THE HBC'S IN SATISFYING BLACK HIGHER EDUCATION NEEDS

According to Keeton (1971, p. 18), "there is the crucial possibility that for many students learning proceeds more deeply, cogently, and rapidly under circumstances of congenial ideological sponsorship and climate." To the accomplishments of the HBC's, this statement seems most applicable. Simply stated, they do for the less prepared and the minority student, what the elite and flagship institutions do for the more prepared and majority student. Little data exist describing what goes on in the process between admissions and graduation, but essentially the HBC's are doing a noteworthy job of expanding the numbers of Black graduates. The HBC's provide realistic opportunities for the less prepared and less wealthy student to obtain a baccalaureate and higher degree.

The focus of the HBC's from their origins to today reflects in microcosm the changing status of Blacks in this country. The institutions have changed to parallel the changes of their clientele; yet their primary mission has remained the same.

Mays (in Willie and Edmonds, 1978, p. 36) summarizes the various mission statements of the HBC's as follows:

> One theme, however, unites all of them: attracting, educating, and graduating men and women who otherwise would not have gone to college. The black colleges are aware that, for many of their students, attending college is not a question of which but of whether. Although some students may have gaps in their educational background, the colleges aim at much more than compensatory education. They wish to graduate seniors whose diplomas mark the completion of undergraduate education, not simply the removal of educational handicaps.

Much of the contribution made by Black colleges to student development and achievement derives from this inherent philosophical approach. Black colleges tend to accept students at their own cognitive level and build in the particular strengths needed for academic success. In a study of 32 historically Black graduate schools, Lynch (1979, p. 73) found differences among white and Black institutions in application of admissions criteria. Where white schools admit students with marginal criteria on a conditional basis, Black schools administer proficiency tests and, where necessary, remediate deficiencies through special programs aimed at developing skills requisite for successful graduate work. Thus, HBC's have a strong commitment to student development. This quality not only makes them attractive to the high risk student but also to the better prepared student as well.

The rediscovery of the HBC sector by many students for which a wider choice is available illustrates the continued resiliency of this group of colleges and universities. United Negro College Fund (UNCF) data (Davis and Kirschner, 1977) indicate that students at private HBC's tend to choose

UNCF institutions out of a desire to attend a predominantly Black college. This reason, along with the academic reputation and the availability of financial aid was among the most frequent reasons given for attendance at Black institutions (57.1, 38.3, and 35.0 percent of responses, respectively) in a recent UNCF survey. UNCF spokesperson, Harriet Schimel ("Freshman Enrollment", July 10, 1978) attributes the recent 12.4 percent increase in freshman enrollment at private HBC's to a combination of reasons:

- lower costs at HBC's (an average of 20 percent less than at private white colleges);
- HBC's are viewed as success routes by poor students;
- the return to the concept of attending a Black school, a reaction to the feelings of isolation experienced by Blacks on white campuses in the 1960's; and
- second-generation college students are asserting the family tradition and returning to Black colleges.

Also, nonminority students have begun to alter the racial mix at many Black colleges. Where traditionally, white students at Black colleges were concentrated in graduate and professional programs and in schools of education, there appears to be a trend toward increased numbers in the lower divisions (Standley, 1978, p.5). Among the observations noted by white students on Black campuses were: (1) the benefits derived from cross-cultural/multi-racial experiences which can be applied to effectiveness in future careers; (2) a heightened appreciation of different ways of life resulting from being at a Black institution; and (3) educational experiences which are closely tied to future job plans (Ibid, p. 10). Hence, the benefits of attendance at a Black college are not exclusive to Black students; white students stand to gain the skills and sensitivities necessary to operate in a multi-racial world.

Additionally, Black colleges represent an invaluable resource for training professional manpower. Lynch (1979, p. 63) found that HBC's enrolled the following percents of Blacks in graduate and professional programs in the Southern region:

- 90 percent in Agriculture and Natural Resources
- 71 percent in Biological Sciences
- 71 percent in Architecture and Environmental Design
- 54 percent in Physical Sciences
- 99 percent in Veterinary Medicine
- 77 percent in Dentistry

- 58 percent in Law
- 57 percent in Medicine

In addressing national manpower needs, the impact of Black colleges reaches far beyond the Southern States. TACTICS (1979) reports that of the 597,000 Black college alumni reported in the U. S. Census data for 1973-74, 47 percent are located in the Southeastern region, 20 percent in the Northeast, 19 percent in the Midwest, and 14 percent in the West. Thus, better than half of all HBC graduates are located and serving outside of the Southeastern region. The distribution of these graduates has great impact not only in terms of satisfying the manpower and affirmative action needs of the Nation, but in serving the needs of Black communities as well.

The cultural and leadership role assumed by the Black college is evident not only through an impressive list of graduates, but through the impact and model the HBC's serve in the Black community. In areas where Black colleges are concentrated, there exists a sizable cadre of Black graduates and professionals. Black colleges have been instrumental as advocates of Black interests on a number of fronts. The civil rights movement was spawned and cultivated through the manpower supplied by the Black colleges. Brown's counsel in Brown v. Board of Education reads like a Who's Who of Black graduates and affiliates of Black law schools (Washington, 1974, p. 409). On the more mundane day-to-day level, Black colleges provide a plethora of services and technical assistance to communities through their affiliated administrative and service units (e.g., day care facilities, extension services and continuing education facilities, hospitals, museums, community mental health centers, etc.). The service role played by the Black colleges extends from the most circumspect local level to the international level as in the case of Howard University which enrolls a sizable foreign student population.

A. Student Characteristics

In 1976, nearly 88 percent of students at HBC's were Black (Turner and Michael, 1978, p. 2). Although the 102 HBC's were responsible for enrolling 17.8 percent of all Blacks in higher education, they conferred 37 percent of all baccalaureate degrees received by Blacks in 1975-76 (NACBHEBCU, 1978, pp. 15 and 22). Additionally, 95 percent of students at HBC's were enrolled at the four-year or university level (Ibid, p. 13). In comparison, 50 percent of Black students in colleges other than the HBC's were enrolled in two-year colleges (NACBHEBCU, 1979, p. 20). The contribution of HBC's in enrolling Black post-baccalaureate students is also outstanding. According to NACBHEBCU data, in many States where HBC's are located,nearly half or more of Black graduate students were in HBC's (Ibid, p. 29). This is an impressive record which other types of institutions have not surpassed.

Historically Black colleges enroll a large proportion of students from families in the lower economic levels. Astin and Cross (1977) found that 48 percent of incoming freshmen at predominantly Black institutions in Fall 1976 had parental incomes of $8,000 or less where only 7 percent of the white students at predominantly white institutions came from families with similar income levels. Also, a higher proportion of Blacks at predominantly white institutions than at predominantly Black institutions reported parental incomes of $15,000 or more. Thus, the HBC's serve a lower income group than white colleges within and between racial groups.

Comparative data on students at the 41 private UNCF member institutions and a Student Resource Survey (SRS) reference group composed of 133 predominantly white private colleges (Davis and Kirschner, 1977) indicate differences in student financing of the college education. Direct and indirect college expenses for the UNCF group were substantially less than for the SRS group ($3,331 vs. $4,443). Tuition and fees accounted for the major difference ($1,718 at UNCF institutions and $2,410 at SRS institutions). The range between median family incomes for students in each group was great ($6,815 median family income for the UNCF group vs. $16,879 for the SRS group). While the average family contribution (including family and student) represented 19.7 percent of the UNCF student's expense, for students at predominantly white colleges, it was 45.1 percent. UNCF students obtained an average of 80.3 percent of their total educational income from financial aid sources, where the SRS students obtained 54.9 percent from these sources.

Because HBC's service a disproportionately large share of economically disadvantaged students, the HBC's and their students are extremely dependent on Federal financial aid assistance. In FY 1971, 44 percent ($74 million) of Federal monies received by Black colleges went for student assistance. Only 26 percent of Federal funds going to other colleges was for student assistance. (Federal Interagency Committee on Education, 1973, p. 5). In FY 1972, Federally funded student aid programs accounted for 41 percent ($106 million) of the total Federal assistance to Black colleges and 33 percent ($82 million) in 1973, compared to 25 and 22 percent at all colleges for the respective years. (FICE, FY 1972 and 1973, no date, p. 4).

Not only do students at HBC's differ from students at comparable colleges in their socioeconomic status and ways of financing their education, they also differ in precollege preparation.

The Astin and Cross study found that Black students at HBC's had lower high school grades than both whites and Blacks at predominantly white institutions. Findings from ACT's Institutional Data Questionnaire (Clayton, 1978) for 1976-77 indicated that freshmen at HBC's tended to have lower ACT mean composites (12 vs. 20), lower mean SAT Verbal (336 vs. 474), and lower mean SAT Math (349 vs. 502) scores, than freshmen at all colleges and universities. Mean high school grade point averages (GPA) for HBC freshmen were also lower than national norms (2.3 vs. 2.6). In spite of these differences among incoming students, HBC's had similar overall retention rates (60 percent) as all colleges and universities (59 percent). Additionally, almost one-fourth (24 percent) of HBC graduates went on to attend graduate and professional schools, compared to the national norm of 33 percent. (Ibid, p. 8).

B. Curricula Offerings

The 102 historically Black colleges and universities are comprised of 40 public and 62 private institutions. The majority are four-year institutions (86) offering bachelor and higher degrees, and 16 are two-year institutions offering the associate degree. Thirty-four institutions offer graduate and/or professional degrees.

Academic majors offered at the HBC's are shown in Table 5. Comparisons between majors offered in 1973 and those offered five years later illustrate vertical and horizontal curriculum growth over this period. In 1973, majors offered were typical of liberal arts curricula and the teacher training tradition at the HBC's. A limited number of technical or agricultural-related majors were available. Almost all of the institutions offered some form of major in education. Also, a large number of the colleges indicated majors in business areas, such as accounting, business administration, and economics. Although a large number of the colleges offered majors in the natural and physical sciences (e.g., the biology major was offered in 87 institutions; chemistry in 75; physics in 43), few institutions had majors in more specific or related areas (e.g., anatomy, physiology, biochemistry, ecology). Other areas of limited offerings were in allied health and therapy fields, pre-medicine and pre-dentistry, police science, architecture, and animal and veterinary sciences.

The 1978 list of majors indicates a broadening of offerings at many colleges. Traditional fields such as education and business were diversified at institutions where they already existed. Early childhood and science education were new curriculum additions at many colleges. Business administration showed a near 50 percent increase across institutions, while business education became a new thrust at over 40 institutions. The period between 1973 and 1978 also shows an increase in offerings in non-traditional and technical subject areas.

According to the Office of Public Negro Colleges (February, 1978), academic degree programs at many of the traditionally Black public institutions were expanded for the 1977-78 academic year. New programs in non-traditional areas such as telecommunications and other communications-related areas were begun at Alabama A&M University, Bowie State College, and Texas Southern University. Expanded career options for students in the social services and social welfare were initiated at Alcorn State University, Cheyney State, Coppin State, Langston University, Lincoln University of Pennsylvania, Grambling State, Mississippi Valley State, Norfolk State, South Carolina State, and Tennessee State. Other public Black institutions had increased technical career offerings in business, industry and commerce. Other non-traditional degree programs in

TABLE 5: MAJORS OFFERED AT HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, ACADEMIC YEARS 1973 and 1978

Majors	Undergraduate		Graduate	
	1973-74 N=97 1/	1978-79 N=98 2/	1973-74 N=29	1978-79 N=31
Accounting	49	59	1	2
Afro-American Studies	17	19	4	3
Agriculture	9	13	1	3
Allied Health Fields	2	18	0	1
Anatomy	2	7	1	1
Animal Science	2	7	-	1
Anthropology	3	6	1	1
Architecture	4	9	1	2
Art	51	54	2	2
Art History	6	9	1	1
Biochemistry	4	4	2	3
Biology	87	92	1	14
Botany	12	13	2	2
Business Administration	47	80	8	9
Business Education	19	61	3	7
Chemistry	75	74	9	9
Clinical Medicine	0	0	1	1
Communication Disorders	4	8	1	2
Communications	16	32	2	4
Computer Science	8	27	1	2
Criminal Justice	5	20	0	1
Drafting	1	13	0	0
Drama	29	32	0	0
Earth Science	1	5	0	1
Ecology	1	2	0	1
Economics	50	53	2	4
Education (Christian)	0	4	0	0
Education (Early Childhood)	6	44	1	8
Education (Elementary)	84	85	21	22
Education (Secondary)	58	66	18	17
Education (Science)	0	23	0	4
Education (Special)	23	30	12	14
English	87	88	11	12
Electronics	2	18	0	0
Engineering	12	25	3	3
Finance	8	13	1	1
Forestry	1	5	0	0
French	57	52	5	6
Geography	11	14	1	1
German	17	18	1	1
Gerontology	1	4	0	1
Guidance	2	1	7	17
Health and Physical Therapy	44	70	6	8
Health Science	2	3	1	1
History	81	86	11	10
Home Economics	26	32	6	7
Horticulture	1	5	0	0
Hospital Facilities Management	0	2	1	0
Industrial Administration	4	4	0	0
Industrial Arts	11	25	0	7
Inhalation Therapy	1	4	0	0
International Studies	1	6	0	0
Journalism	9	17	1	1
Law	5	4	4	5

Majors	Undergraduate		Graduate	
	1973-74 N=97 [1]	1978-79 N=98 [2]	1973-74 N=29	1978-79 N=31
Library Science	5	7	2	4
Management	18	26	4	4
Marketing	18	20	2	2
Mathematics	86	89	9	10
Medical Record Library Science	1	3	0	0
Medical Record Science	1	3	0	0
Medical Science	6	4	2	1
Medical Technology	26	35	0	0
Mental Retardation	6	8	3	4
Microbiology	2	3	3	4
Modern Languages	3	11	1	1
Music Education	69	68	8	9
Music Performance	21	25	1	1
Music Theory and Composition	22	24	2	1
Nursing	23	30	0	2
Office Administration	5	19	0	0
Philosophy	25	23	2	2
Physical Therapy	4	7	0	0
Physics	43	51	3	3
Physiology	5	6	1	1
Police Science	1	6	0	0
Political Science	60	66	3	3
Pre-denistry	2	36	-	-
Pre-medicine	5	44	-	-
Pre-lab Technology	0	6	-	-
Pre-optometry	1	7	-	-
Psychology	44	55	6	10
Public Administration	2	7	1	4
Radiologic Technology	2	4	0	0
Religion	23	30	1	2
Remedial Reading	1	4	1	1
Russian	5	4	1	1
Safety and Driver's Trucking Ed.	0	2	0	2
Secretarial Science	17	38	0	1
Social Psychology	1	1	0	1
Social Science	21	42	5	4
Social Welfare	11	32	0	1
Sociology	76	81	6	7
Spanish	42	38	1	1
Speech	14	26	0	2
Technical Education	8	12	1	1
Theology	6	8	2	2
Urban Affairs	8	14	3	5
Veterinary Medicine	2	4	1	1
Zoology	13	11	2	3

---

[1] Data not available for the following HBC's: Alabama Lutheran Academy and College; Arkansas Baptist College; University of Arkansas, Pine Bluff; Clinton Junior College; Daniel Payne College; D.C. Teachers College; Shorter College. Universe of institutions includes remaining HBC's which were predominantly Black in 1973 (including Lincoln University, Missouri).

[2] Data refer to 98 of the 102 HBC's still predominantly Black on the Committee's 1978 listing. Data not available for Alabama Lutheran Academy and College, Arkansas Baptist College, Clinton Junior College, and Daniel Payne College.

Source: National Advisory Committee on Black Higher Education and Black Colleges and Universities staff analysis of majors offered at historically Black colleges in Robert R. Moton Memorial Institute, The Moton Guide to American Colleges with a Black Heritage 1978-79, Washington, D.C., 1973 pp. 64-69 and 1978, pp. 64-69.

transportation, public utilities, engineering, industrial management and computer science had also been added to the curricula of many of the public Black colleges.

UNCF's Annual Statistical Report of Member Institutions '1976,1977 found that in recent years private HBC's have diversified their curricula to meet newer distributions of professional job opportunities for Blacks. Degrees earned in business more than doubled since 1970. In 1969-70, only two UNCF institutions offered degrees in the health professions. By 1974-75, 14 UNCF institutions offered degrees in this area. During the same period, three institutions began offering degrees in computer science, whereas before 1969-70 no UNCF institution offered that degree. Programs in communications were also initiated at two institutions during that period. The greatest change was in the number of engineering programs with cooperating engineering schools. Of note were the number of cooperative programs among UNCF institutions and other historically Black institutions. Of 21 cooperative engineering programs, one-third were with predominantly Black engineering schools.

In recent years public and private institutions have made large strides in diversifying their curricula and preparing students for a variety of professions and careers.

According to the National Board of Graduate Education (June 1976, pp. 195-196), the graduate level programs offered in Black institutions differ in structure and complexity from single degree structures to a comprehensive scheme of offerings. This was also true of doctorate level programs. Of the institutions offering doctoral degrees in 1976, Howard University offered doctoral work in 20 areas, Atlanta University in four areas, Meharry Medical College in three fields, and Texas Southern University in one field. In total, the Black graduate institutions enrolled approximately one-fifth of all Black graduate students.

More detailed data on graduate offerings (USDHEW/OE, Meeting of Deans of Black Graduate Schools, 1976) suggest that Black graduate institutions are providing meaningful access to graduate education for Black Americans. The HEW/OE report found that these graduate schools have clearly diversified their offerings although nearly all continue to offer programs in teacher education. Multiple structures exist particularly in master's programs where over half of the graduate schools offer from four to seven fields outside of education. Black graduate schools offer fields which are in high demand and for which admission is highly competitive at major universities. One such area cited is psychology. Six Black graduate schools offer master's degrees in this area (Alabama A&M, Fisk, Florida A&M and Tennessee State Universities; and Prairie View A&M and Virginia ~~State~~ Colleges). Other degree offerings at Black graduate schools reflect an ability to keep up with the demands of a changing job market. The M.B.A. is offered at nine graduate schools (Alabama A&M, Atlanta, Howard, Jackson State, Morgan State, North Carolina Central, and Texas Southern Universities; and Prairie View A&M and Virginia State Colleges). Degrees in Sociology are offered at seven institutions (Atlanta, Fisk, Florida A&M, Grambling, Howard, North Carolina Central, and Texas Southern Universities). Library science degrees are available at four others (Alabama A&M, Alabama State and North Carolina Central Universities, and Prairie View A&M College). Degrees in Urban Studies are available at Alabama A&M, Howard, Kentucky State, and Morgan State Universities and at Norfolk State University. Howard and North Carolina A&T State Universities, as well as Tuskegee Institute offer the Master's in Engineering.

HBC's also offer areas of study of particular importance to Blacks. Afro-American Studies is offered at Atlanta, Morgan State, Howard and Southern Universities. The complement of master's degrees at Howard University is unsurpassed at many white institutions. Howard offers graduate degrees in disciplines as varied as Russian, African Studies, Comparative Juris Prudence, and Hospital Administration.

These findings disprove many misconceptions about the limited curricula offerings at the HBC's. In the past, curricula in Black institutions were judiciously related to the types of jobs Black graduates were permitted to hold in a segregated society. With the eradication of these barriers, a need for curriculum diversification was created. The HBC's have met this challenge as evidenced in their evolving curricula. In this respect, they are dynamic and responsive to societal trends.

Historically and presently, their curricula has been based on the development of operational skills for the various professions and careers, and limited in areas of research. This has not been an oversight. It has been a reflection of the more immediate priorities of Black people. It has also been influenced by the dictates of college founders, funding sources, as well as legislative bodies. Needed is a continued diversification of curricula, not only horizontally but vertically, and an added research emphasis. The HBC's have proven their strength in worse times. In more recent times, their curricula has been indicative of their flexibility in dealing with more current student and community needs.

C. Faculty Characteristics

According to unpublished Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) data on faculty in higher education for 1975-76, Blacks represent 4.4 percent (19,746) of total full-time faculty. Of this number, 38.4 percent (7,590) are in the HBC's. This is in sharp contrast to the situation prior to 1970 when few Black faculty were found outside of the Black colleges.

EEOC data on distribution of faculty in HBC's by race are shown in Table 6. Although Blacks represent 55.1 percent of faculty in these institutions, there is a greater representation of "other race" faculty in HBC's than in white institutions. Southern Regional Education Board data for the 1976-78 period on faculty in public four-year institutions in the 14 SREB States bear out this fact:

TABLE 6: TOTAL FULL-TIME FACULTY IN HBC's BY RACE, 1975

	Number	Percent
TOTAL	13,770	100.0
Black	7,590	55.1
White	5,487	39.9
Hispanic	195	1.4
Asian American/ Pacific Islander	459	3.3
American Indian/ Alaskan Native	39	.3

Source: Higher Education Staff Information Report (EEO-6), Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 1975

> When 'other race' distribution is related to distribution of total faculty among institutions classified by proportions of black enrollment, the likelihood of black [faculty] representation in the white schools is lower than that of white [faculty] representation in in the black schools. (Galambos, 1979, p. 13)

Preliminary results of a Spring 1977 survey of faculty in HBC's indicate slight differences between HBC faculty and faculty nationally with respect to status and field of specialization. (Institute for Services to Education, November 1977, Chapter 4). By status, HBC faculty were distributed as follows: 17 percent of faculty were professors; 20 percent, associate professors; 33 percent, assistant professors; and 28 percent, lecturers/instructors. The percent of HBC faculty with professor and associate professor status was lower than for faculty nationally (26 percent and 24 percent, respectively), but higher for assistant professor and instructor/lecturer status (25 percent and 16 percent, respectively).*

With respect to field of specialization, HBC faculty tended to be concentrated in the arts and humanities (22 percent), education (19 percent), physical sciences (11 percent), and the social sciences (22 percent). Nationally, all faculty were concentrated in these disciplines as follows: arts and humanities, 25 percent; education, 15 percent; physical sciences, 12 percent; and social sciences, 12 percent. A higher percentage of HBC faculty were found to specialize in business (8 percent) compared to faculty nationally (4 percent), while a lower percentage of HBC faculty were found in engineering (2 percent) compared with 6 percent of faculty in all institutions. By highest degree received, faculty at the HBC's were distributed as follows: Ph.D, 30 percent; Ed.D, 8 percent; medical, and other doctorates, 3 percent; master's 53 percent; and "other", 6 percent. HBC faculty differed from national percentages in having a larger proportion of faculty with Ed.D's (nationally, 3 percent) and master's (nationally 45 percent) as highest degree received.

These data suggest that faculty at historically Black institutions are comparable to faculty at other institutions. The preponderance of doctorates attest to the high quality of faculty employed by these institutions. Differences in faculty characteristics bespeak many of the inherent differences between Black institutions and their predominantly white counterparts. The higher percentage of Ed.D's and persons trained in education in the HBC's is attributable to their past emphasis on teacher training. The smaller percentage of HBC faculty in engineering is again characteristic of curricular emphases at the HBC's and the fact that engineering has not been a traditional career path for many minorities. The differences in the teachning status of HBC faculty from their counterparts nationally suggest different patterns in ability to acquire, pay and promote higher level college teachers as well as an emphasis on teaching over other characteristic activities of college faculty.

---

*Comparisons with all faculty are based on American Council on Education faculty data for 1972-73 and therefore may not be totally comparable with 1977 data for HBC faculty.

Thompson (in Willie and Edmonds, 1978) notes that since HBC's have never had the funds and influence to adequately support their urgent mission of transforming socioeconomically and academically handicapped black youth into productive citizens, a heavy burden has fallen upon the faculty to accomplish this mission. Hence, "Teaching is not only the primary role but very often the only professional role expected of black college faculties." (Ibid, p. 189) The nonteaching responsibilities incumbent upon these faculties coupled with the undergraduate nature of their institutions often preclude research-type activities highly valued in faculty at other types of institutions. Thus, particular characteristics of the HBC's and their student populations tend to impact the types of responsibilities undertaken by their faculties as well as the institutions' ability to attract and maintain faculty.

The restraints which HBC's have traditionally operated under in this regard have contributed to the "brain drain" of Black academe to other institutions in recent years. Moreover, affirmative action and integration have greatly affected the proportion of Black faculty teaching in the HBC's and intensified the competition for Black doctorates.

Mommsen (1978) found the pool of Black doctorates to be generally of high quality, having obtained terminal degrees from large, prestigious white institutions located outside of the South. He concluded that this represented a mixed blessing for the HBC's in that the high quality of Black doctorates intensified demand and price levels. Hence, a substantial raise (about $6,000) was necessary for a move to a white campus to be contemplated.

Reasons generally cited for the "brain drain" of Black college teachers from the HBC's usually relate to salary differentials between white and Black institutions. The Southern Regional Educational Board (1969) found that for 1967-68 in the South, where most HBC's are located, a salary differential of from 5 to 8 percent existed in favor of white institutions. This differential was magnified when HBC's were compared with colleges in the West and North.

Additionally, the challenge and prestige which positions at white institutions offer figure into the ability of Black institutions to retain qualified faculty. With affirmative action programs being vigorously pursued by predominantly white institutions, Black doctorates are in high demand at some of the most prestigious white institutions. Many Black faculty have been seduced by these types of opportunities.

Finally, many Black college teachers have become disenchanted with the HBC's due to many of their characteristic restraints--poor facilities, inadequate equipment, limited opportunity to do research, and the undesirable locations of the HBC's, many of which are in rural locations. The traditional focus in the HBC's on compensatory learning impacts their attractiveness for many faculty regardless of race, and limits the pool of potential faculty to those willing to meet the challenge of instructing culturally and economically deprived students.

These types of limitations serve to both prescribe and enhance the unique qualities of the HBC's. According to Willie and MacLeish (in Willie and Edmonds, 1978, p. 141), "presidents of black colleges now must give as much attention to refurbishing or expanding the physical plant and to finding funds for student aid, faculty salaries, library and teaching materials as to other educational matters." Again, the interrelated pattern of institutional finance, student financial need, and faculty and curriculum requisites continue to weigh heavily in setting the HBC's apart from the remainder of the college sector. The emphasis on equitable treatment growing from the Adams mandate* will do much toward helping the public Black colleges to attract and maintain quality faculty with the appropriate commitment to the type of instruction the HBC's have characteristically offered. Private colleges must find other sources in order not to be priced out of the market for quality faculty, especially quality Black faculty.

Where Title III funds for faculty development have helped institutions such as the HBC's to build quality faculty, other efforts are needed to help HBC's diversify faculty by disciplines which will in turn impact the level and quality of curricular offerings. Additionally, opportunities and facilities for research must be available in order to attract and maintain quality faculty. Bacon (in Johnson, 1974, p. 157) suggested ways for Black colleges to improve the quantity and quality of research on campus:

- devise reward systems for both the teacher and the researcher;
- compete with predominantly white institutions in recruiting faculty by at least assuring prospective faculty members of moral support in doing research;
- encourage student participation in research projects; and
- compute faculty work time with consideration for research activities.

---

*Adams v. Richardson, 480F, 2d, 1159 (D.C. Cir. 1973) - ruling which directed HEW to secure acceptable desegregation plans from 10 States.

Surely, these types of efforts are made in the HBC's, but the problem continuously comes down to finance and priorities. Traditionally, HBC's have not had the luxury to relieve faculty from teaching for research-type activities and scholarly pursuits. Federal and foundation funds are extremely necessary for HBC's to pursue this type of approach.

D. Aspects of Funding and Financing

Financial viability of institutions is generally linked to stability of enrollment. This is especially true for private institutions where dependence on student tuition and fees is greater than at public supported institutions. HEW figures indicate that 65 percent of the cost of education for students at private institutions is covered by tuition and fees while only 22 percent of such revenues is used at public institutions for this purpose (Comptroller General, 1978, p. 16). Public institutions are of course dependent upon the public's response to taxation and State allocation patterns. Although some indications exist which point to a potential change in taxpayer attitude toward public support of higher education on the State level, by and large, the public institutions face healthier prospects for financial stability than do private institutions. Differences in the support afforded public and private HBC's should be kept in mind when the viability of Black colleges are considered.

Analyses of financial well-being in the private sector are not totally consistent. A report from the Comptroller Genreal's Office states that one-fourth to one-third of all private institutions are experiencing financial difficulty due to interrelated problems created by declining enrollments, increasing tuition gap between public and private institutions, competition for students brought on by the growth of the community colleges, rising costs and inflation, and lack of effective administrative controls (Ibid, pp. 12 and 22). Hardest hit have been the institutions listed in the Carnegie Commission's classification of schools as Liberal Arts II Colleges (includes 38 private HBC's and 2 NPBC's). This study cited 49 of the 74 colleges and universities listed as deliquent or in deferred payment status on HUD Reserve Bank listings and HEW facility construction loans in 1975 as belonging to the Liberal Arts II group. Also, 29 of the 38 private institutions which closed between 1970 and 1975 were Liberal Arts II schools.

On the other hand, Minter and Bowen (1978, p. 50) indicate a more positive picture of the private sector. Their findings suggest that revenues have at least kept pace with inflation in recent years; however, this marginal success leaves little room for improvement in educational programs and faculty and staff compensation beyond cost-of-living increases.

Similar findings apply to the HBC's. Data extracted from the Higher Education General Information Survey (HEGIS) for 1972-73 and 1974-75 indicate that a 21 percent growth in current funds revenue was matched by similar growth in current funds expenditures; therefore, these colleges experienced no appreciable financial gain over the period (See Table 7). These data indicate that HBC's are at least holding their own financially.

For the private sector, it remains a marginal issue however. The Library of Congress Congressional Research Service reported (based on HEGIS data) a thin +0.1 percent surplus for private HBC's compared with a +1.2 percent surplus for public HBC's (1977, p. 14). Minimal surpluses in private institutions point to vulnerability and potential financial stress, as well as inability for improvement of educational programs and faculty increases, as also suggested in the Minter and Bowen report.* In areas where private HBC's need to diversify curricula and hire and/or redistribute faculty in response to changing discipline needs, financial restraints figure heavily as these institutions strive for mainstream status and up-to-date curricula necessary to compete with public and other private institutions.

In spite of this slim margin, several positive trends are identifiable from the Library of Congress analysis:

1. No downward trend in percent of funds for instruction and research from educational and general expenditures was found between 1972-73 and 1974-75. Public institutions reported a rise from 44 percent to 46 percent while private institutions saw a rise from 36 percent to 45 percent. Any downward trend in this percentage generally signifies potential institutional stress.

2. Increases in educational and general expenditures as percent of total expenditures were also found.

The UNCF Annual Statistical Report (1976) for 41 private HBC's does not differ drastically in its report of the financial health of Black institutions in 1974-75, however, it presents a bleaker picture of the precarious nature of finances at the private institutions. Although revenues and expenditures were roughly equal in 1974-75, expenditures increased 37.3 percent in the period from 1971-72 to 1974-75 while revenues increased only 32 percent over the same period. Similar differences for revenues and expenditures per student were also noted. (See Table 8)

These findings are based on aggregate data and do not indicate deficits or surpluses at individual institutions. UNCF reports that in 1974-75, 20 or roughly half of its member institutions experienced budget deficits (Ibid, p. 31).

---

*Minimal surpluses take on different implications for public institutions since in most States, fiscal year-end surpluses must revert to State treasuries. Thus, institutions in public systems tend to spend total budgets least it be assumed appropriation levels were unwarranted.

TABLE 7: CURRENT FUNDS REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES FOR HBC's*, 1972-73 and 1974-75

Year	Control	Current Funds Revenues	Revenue/ FTE	Current Funds Expenditures	Expenditure/ FTE
1972-73	Total	$669,158,888	$3,975	$660,803,790	$3,926
	Public	335,640,353	2,988	332,258,302	2,958
	Private	333,518,535	5,957	328,545,488	5,868
1974-75	Total	808,658,695	4,965	803,120,275	4,922
	Public	426,726,166	3,768	421,670,781	3,723
	Private	381,932,529	7,651	381,449,494	7,641

*Data extracted from HEGIS apply to 102 HBC's.

Source: Library of Congress Congressional Research Service, "The Historically Black Colleges: Prospects and Options for Federal Support," Education and Public Welfare Division, January 17, 1977, pp. 10 and 12.

TABLE 8: TOTAL AND PER STUDENT REVENUE AND EXPENDITURES FOR UNCF INSTITUTIONS,* 1971-72 and 1974-75

	1971-72	1974-75	% Change
Revenues	$125,167,367	$165,242,006	+32.0
Expenditures	120,266,739	165,174,808	+37.3
Revenues Per Student	3,675	4,710	+28.2
Expenditures Per Student	3,531	4,708	+33.3

*Based on 34 of the 41 member institutions.

Source: United Negro College Fund, Annual Statistical Report, 1976, pp. 30 and 31.

Using 1975 HEGIS data for 48 private and 28 State assisted institutions, Jones and Weathersby (in Willie and Edmonds, 1978, pp. 119-123) related the following findings:

1. Regarding patterns of expenditures--private HBC's spent less on instruction and more on student aid than did the public Black sector. Excluding differing amounts spent on student aid, the sectors were similar in spending patterns for operating purposes.

2. The sample of private institutions experienced a deficit balance (average of $3,223) while public institutions had average surplus balances of $603,172.

3. Independent colleges put a greater percentage of their capital funds receipts in endowment, scholarships and student loan accounts (28.6 percent vs. 4.7 percent for public HBC's) while public institutions tended to reinvest in their physical plants.

4. 75 percent of students at HBC's received financial aid. Although most of this is Federal aid, part is institutional aid. HBC's generally incurred deficits in student aid accounts due to a tendency to exceed earmarked accounts. Deficits incurred were usually offset by long-term borrowing and diverting funds from instructional programs.

5. Taken together, Black colleges allocated greater proportions of their capital assets for student aid and loans than did all other institutions which tended to allocate capital asset funds as follows: physical plant, 75 percent; endowment, 22 percent; student loans, 1 percent; annuity and trust funds, 2 percent.

6. The Federal government was not only an important source for current operations funds, but an important source of capital funds as well.

Although the studies discussed here do not always agree point for point, they definitely coincide in their implications for the future health of the private Black sector. Unless present trends are reversed, this sector may encounter increasing distress in the years ahead.

Many of the present and future problems affecting the private HBC's are directly related to their service to large numbers of low-income and disadvantaged students. Their high dependence on Federal funds for current funding revenue (38 percent in 1975, compared to 14 percent for other private institutions) make them exceedingly vulnerable to fluctuations in Federal policy even though much of this funding relates to the services provided for low-income and disadvantaged students. (See Table 9) The financial gap between actual student needs and the needs met by Federal financial programs, must be met by the institutions themselves. The tendency of Black colleges to reinvest assets in student aid efforts

TABLE 9: PERCENTAGE OF CURRENT FUNDS REVENUES FROM PUBLIC SOURCES FOR 102 HBC's AND ALL COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES*, 1974-75

Public Source	Control	HBC'S	All Colleges and Universities
Federal	Total	29%	14%
	Public	21%	14%
	Private	38%	14%
State	Total	24%	31%
	Public	45%	44%
	Private	1%	2%
Local	Total	1%	4%
	Public	1%	6%
	Private	1%	1%

*Data derived from HEGIS and may not necessarily be comparable to other data gathered from Federal agencies because institutions are not able to identify original source of all current funds revenues.

Source: Library of Congress Congressional Research Service, "The Historically Black Colleges,Prospects and Options for Federal Support," Education and Public Welfare Division, January 17, 1977, p. 27.

instead of channeling these funds into long-term investments, such as endowments, lessen their potential for building the capital necessary for future viability.

This foremost commitment to student attainment as evidenced through provision for financial aid is seen not only on the undergraduate level, but on the graduate and professional levels as well. Lynch (1979, p. 67) found that in 1976, Black institutions provided more fellowship and assistantship aid to graduate students than the Federal government and States combined. Where Federal and State interests stand to benefit from the investment made in the education and training of largely low-income student groups, funding should be directed toward the institutions where the greatest number of these students are found.

Lacking the broader base of public support guaranteed to the public Black institutions for current funds revenue, having low endowments (an average of $2,412,134 for UNCF institutions) and marginal surpluses (and in some cases, deficits), private HBC's are allowed little room for error when calculating their future survival. Moreover, the *Adams* decision in desegregating State institutions is bound to affect them. Since formerly white institutions in the *Adams* States must show appreciable efforts to desegregate their student bodies, it seems reasonable that these white institutions will begin to compete more openly with HBC's for the available Black student pool. Moreover, since many of the HBC's are in the *Adams* States, and enrollment stability is closely linked to financial stability drawn from tuition and fees for current fund revenues, a bleak forecast emerges for the private Black colleges.

It is essential that these institutions rely on broader sources of financing such as endowment revenues, private gifts, and alliances with business and industry. UNCF reports an effort to develop these types of alliances in endowment building. A consortium of six HBC's (Bishop College, Fisk University, Rust College, St. Augustine's College, Tuskegee Institute, and Virginia Union University) recently raised $2.4 million which was matched by loans from nine insurance companies. The $2.4 million will be the basis of an endowment fund, which, when invested, will help to maintain school operations and repay the initial loan. (*Higher Education Daily*, July 10, 1978). This is one healthy sign and demonstrates the potential for success for creative alternatives to private financing of these institutions.

Historically, lack of alumni financial support has plagued Black colleges. Between 1969-70 and 1975-76, UNCF reported a 339.7 percent increase in alumni gifts to private Black colleges. Although private Black colleges are still raising less on the average through alumni campaigns than private institutions nationally, the substantial increase in alumni giving should be interpreted positively. According to UNCF officials, "Black families still earn only 65 percent of the median income of white families. Until this difference is significantly reduced, there is likely to be a similar difference in total alumni support between private colleges nationally and private black colleges." ("Alumni Gifts to Private Black Colleges," January 30, 1978, p. 10). Thus Black colleges continue to be victimized by forces in the society which directly and indirectly frustrate their attainment of a strong financial base.

Creative solutions must be found for addressing their needs. Greater emphasis on developmental activities is necessary. Greater availability of Federal funds for development efforts is evident. Funds brought into the institution via these efforts would go to replace Federal dollars and relieve private HBC's from dependency on inadequate Federal support.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FINANCING AND PLANNING FOR DIVERSITY

A healthy and viable higher education system is dependent upon the relationship and balance between its components and their responsiveness to a variety of student needs. Achieving this balance calls for orchestration and consideration of the unique qualities inherent in the various sectors of higher education and controlling for the differential impact of changing trends and policies on them. If Federal policy growing out of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is committed to promoting a diversified system of postsecondary education as to purpose and control,then a coordinated effort on the national level is required to obtain this goal.

Following are several variables which impact diversity and must be considered in any effort to provide for a healthy and responsive postsecondary education structure.

- Tuition and fees represent only a limited portion of the cost of educating a student at both public and private institutions.
- Greater dependence upon student tuition and fees make private institutions exceedingly vulnerable to fluctuations in enrollment levels.
- The superior resources available to the public institutions and their ability to subsidize student tuitions have made them attractive not only to low-income students but to wealthier students as well.
- Through Federal student financial aid programs, students have the ability to impact diversity by utilizing their consumer options. Where financial aid policies have differential impact on student distribution, they create an imbalance in student distribution between certain types of institutions.
- State policies exist which subsidize the private sector in proportion to its role in satisfying the educational needs of the State.
- State policies do not always have uniform impact on all public institutions where student body characteristics and past funding levels are different.
- The evidence of racism persists in the uneven resources available to historically white and historically Black public institutions. Where years of differential funding have made these institutions distinctly separate and

unequal, a more equal distribution of funds and in most cases "catch up" aid is required to effectuate a more equitable balance between these racially different public institutions.

- Owing to elitism in higher education, full worth has not been afforded the less visible institutions and those making the greatest contribution to the Nation's affirmative action goals. Hence, institutions providing this essential role do not always benefit from varied sources of funding accorded the more prestigious schools. Moreover, the institutional commitment to a lower income clientele often places a heavier burden on these institutions in terms of financial aid resources, and special services for academically less prepared students.

These variables have not been uniformly addressed in much higher education policy determination to date. To the extent that diversity affects access and attainment for groups underrepresented in higher education, a stronger stance in ensuring that pluralistic structures exist and are able to provide a quality educational experience must be pursued.

A. State Policies Impacting Diversity

The State governments have played and continue to play vital roles in promulgating diversity. States have not only subsidized public higher education, but private higher education as well. State support to the private sector is generally correlated with the size of private enrollment within its borders. Currently, one-half of the States give direct aid to private institutions, while two-thirds give both institutional and student support (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1976, p. 80). Categorical institutional support takes many forms, namely, general purpose grants based on enrollment, aid for construction, extension of tax exempt status, and tax credits to individuals and corporations for contributions to private colleges.

These are but a few methods used by States to ensure an equitable balance between public and private institutions and to promote diversity. This is not simply an altruistic gesture, but reflects the symbiotic relationship between the public and private sectors in servicing the needs of the population, and acknowledgment of the replacement costs were private institutions no longer in existence.

Black institutions in States which maintained de jure systems of higher education have not received the level of concern given the white private sector with respect to creating a balance of diverse institutions as to purpose and control. The present problems facing the Adams States and other similar States, and the problems impacting the health of the public Black sector can be traced to three interrelated offshoots of segregation:

(1) lack of Black representation in policy determination;

(2) discriminatory funding to Black institutions; and

(3) general neglect on the part of State governing bodies.

Where private Black colleges initially received aid from private and church-related sources, and later derived limited State assistance from general measures aimed at strengthening the private sector, public Black colleges have generally encountered neglect and differential funding from States through their years of development.

Uneven development of Black and white land-grant institutions attests to the level of neglect reserved for the Black public sector. State imposed legal sanctions cut them off from much Federal support awarded other land-grant colleges and universities. Moreover, discriminatory State funding has deliberately stunted their growth.

The fallacy of "separate but equal" is clearly illustrated in the treatment afforded the public Black institutions. Where separation was maintained, equality of treatment was not. Only now, when forced integration of dual systems suggests that State schools must provide equal opportunities for all races, has equal treatment of the Black sector become a seeming possibility. However, years of differential funding and neglect require that States go beyond the notion of equal treatment to provide preferential treatment to the public Black sector. This notion is not derived from eleemosynary motives, but is based upon the reasons that: (1) institutions should receive State aid in proportion to their contribution to the education goals of the State; and (2) where unequal treatment has been documented in the past, efforts are required to remediate past injustices and elevate institutions to the same status as others in the State.

National population and college attendance rates for Blacks differ markedly by region. Higher percentages than the National averages for Blacks in the general population (11.5 percent) and in the college population (9.3 percent) are evident in the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) States (18.8 percent and 15.1 percent, respectively). (Mingle, 1978) On the graduate level, the South also shows greater Black participation (10.1 percent in SREB States; 6.0 percent, nationally). Of the 426,000 Black students enrolled in Southern institutions in 1976, 43 percent were in HBC's. The existence of HBC's in this region contributes to the better than average Black participation rates in higher education, particularly in graduate and professional education. Analyses resulting when HBC enrollment is disaggregated from total enrollment show more clearly the important role of the HBC's in the Southern region (NACBHEBCU, 1979, p. 29-30). Hence the HBC's, represent an invaluable resource nationally, but particularly in the Southern States. Unfortunately, Black institutions both public and private in this region have not received State support commensurate with their role in satisfying local and regional educational and manpower goals.

Speaking of the importance of the Black graduate and professional schools to the South, Lynch (1979, p. 20) states:

> The schools are in the South which has the highest percent of the nation's blacks, the highest percent of blacks in the age bracket of 20-34, the highest percent of blacks in postbaccalaureate study, the lowest median income for blacks, and the lowest ratio of black to white income.

Clearly, there exists a need for expanding the numbers of Blacks and low-income students in higher education and training more Black professionals Nationally, but also in the South. In that the majority of HBC's are in the South, they represent preexisting resources for accomplishing this task. Lacking are remedial efforts on the part of many States to bring these institutions up to mainstream status so that they may continue to provide the high quality instruction and services necessary for their students, continue to produce needed Black graduates and professionals, and compete favorably with other institutions.

Moreover, equitable treatment involves an understanding of the roots of difference between formerly all white and all Black institutions and articulating policy which controls for these differences. Thus, where uniform State policies have differential impact on predominantly white and Black institutions, they should be altered so as not to affect the Black sector adversely.

A NAFEO study (1977) found a recent trend toward centralized control. Uniform State policies brought a degree of leverage to the treatment afforded public Black colleges in the South, however, these policies often have differential effects on the Black sector due to the clientele and history of these institutions. Findings relative to selective policies indicate:

1. Ceilings on out-of-state students have a disproportionate affect on HBC's due to their tradition of enrolling students nationally and regionally.
2. Introduction of new programs is hampered by State coordination and retrenchment policies thereby restricting the vertical and horizontal development of these institutions. Moreover, policies for program continuation tend to specify that programs must graduate a specificied number of students in a given time. This type of policy particularly affects HBC's where students tend to take a longer time to complete their studies.
3. Proposed uniform admission criteria for State institutions fail to consider the characteristics of the particular clientele at Black institutions, and are sure to present problems if strictly enforced.

4. State budget formulas do not generally include funds to adequately cover compensatory education required on most Black college campuses. Moreover, institutions are often penalized through efforts to limit the size of these courses through State provisions withholding funds to classes with less than 10 students. Additionally, increased emphasis on standardized tests for compensatory education comes at a time when additional funds are not forthcoming.

5. State budget formulas based on current FTE do not take into account past deprivation of the Black sector, and do not strive to balance the historical and resource advantages accrued by traditionally white institutions (e.g. endowed chairs, flow of services from equipment, accumulated university foundation resources, etc.).

6. Failure to consider differential effects of large numbers of students on financial aid also impacts the Black institutions. For example, matching funds for Federal College Work-Study programs often come from institutions' operating budgets. In some States, no appropriations are made for matching funds required by the Federal government.

A report from the Southern Regional Education Board (1977) indicates a period of retrenchment in funding to public higher education in the South. Gains in appropriations were primarily earmarked to compensate for inflation and salary raises. Few new programs were approved and seven of fourteen SREB States currently have moratoriums on addition of new doctoral programs. Appropriations to community colleges increased at a higher rate than for other sectors despite declines in community college enrollment. Georgia, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee and Texas raised financial support of the private sector.

Many of these trends serve to reinforce policies and allocation patterns discussed in the NAFEO study. Retrenchment moves on the part of States will hit public Black colleges the hardest. Where traditionally white colleges have been privy to the largess of State funds during better times, the institution of budgetary restraints in a period where equal treatment of public Black colleges is finding acceptance will serve to further impede their growth. Now is the time for coordinated efforts between States and the Federal government to address the present and future needs of Black colleges in light of past injustices.

Concerns such as these require that State planning bodies develop planning initiatives which work to benefit and not adversely affect Black institutions, and work in the interest of the State's affirmative action and manpower developent goals. It is recommended that, 1.0. State planning efforts should consider the unique histories of the HBC's, both public and private and their present and potential role in the development of Black college graduates Statewide. Where uniform policies have differential impact on the Black sector they should be altered in the best interest of the Black communities which these institutions characteristically serve.

Subsequent actions required to offset adverse impact of uniform State policies on public HBC's include, but are not limited to, the following specific recommendations that,

1.1. Any policy involving ceilings on out-of-State students should neither be uniformly applied in such a way as to lessen the opportunities for Black students to obtain and enforce their choice of institution attended nor should it limit the role of the Black college in expanding the number of Blacks and low-income students in higher education.

This approach, perforce, calls for a cooperative arrangement among States, and between States and the Federal government. It requires nationwide planning to assure broad access to higher education for minorities and in institutions where minorities are traditionally concentrated.

Additional State policies requiring flexibility and sensitivity to the unique role of public HBC's suggest that,

1.2. Admissions criteria for State institutions should not be uniform and inflexible, but should parallel the missions of the institutions and weigh criteria, as appropriate, to ensure a diverse student body within the total State system.

1.3. Cost-of-instruction subsidies should be provided by States to cover additional costs related to compensatory services based upon the proportion of enrollment in need of these services.

1.4. "Catch up" aid over and beyond State budget formulas should be provided to Black colleges to balance out past discriminatory funding. Such aid could be used for updating curricular programs, acquiring equipment, facilities, library and media holdings, and providing for endowed chairs and the like.

1.5. All States should allocate matching funds for Federal work-study programs so that institutions with large numbers of low-income students are not forced to use operating funds for this purpose.

1.6. *Program continuation policies should not be uniform throughout State systems, but should consider the characteristics of students at a given institution in terms of length of time needed for degree completion and financial resources available to students.*

Where diversity as to control is a clearly defined and accepted concept, there exists a contradictory posture with respect to the maintenance of diversity based upon racial characteristics. This is because racism is anathema to our democratic principles; yet, racism is an ingrained fact of American life no matter how repugnant it may be. The direction of integration efforts in the *Adams* States points to an emphasis on adjusting the mix of other race students at historically Black and white institutions. Experience gained in the 25 years since the *Brown** decision suggests that guaranteeing a particular racial mix is not the sole solution for ending racism and providing equal educational opportunities for minorities. Loss of a minority sensitive environment such as that typically afforded in the HBC's is not an even trade-off and may be a setback in equal educational opportunities for Blacks. Therefore, a new definition of integration of higher education may be needed -- one that recognizes racial diversity and the need for a minority dominated environment to counteract the impact of the majority dominated environment of this country. Such a definition would retain a role for Black colleges in the education of Black and other youth as part of an historical and ongoing commitment. It is recommended that,

2.0. *In efforts to desegregate State higher education systems, emphasis should be geared toward ensuring that Black public institutions are, within the parameters of their respective missions, fully prepared to serve as educational resources for all citizens in their immediate communities and States in particular and in the Nation in general.*

This presupposes and requires that:

2.1. *The missions of the public HBC's are clearly defined and commensurate with those of comparable institutions as to size and purpose.*

2.2. *Academic programs which complement their missions are a part of their curricular offerings.*

2.3. *The personnel, fiscal, and physical resources essential to the exercise of their missions are adequate.*

**Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka*, 347 U.S. 483.

Desegregation of higher education is obtained when institutions have removed all barriers to significant other race involvement at the student, faculty and administrative levels and there is evidence of presence, advancement and production. In areas, such as hiring of faculty and staff, where institutions have had some measure of control, public Black colleges have evidenced equality of opportunity since the Brown decision. Where law allowed, barriers to significant other race participation have not been enforced. It is important to note that Blacks and Black institutions were recipients of de jure segregation, and not active in instituting the practice. Thus, desegregation of public higher education as it applies to HBC's is a misnomer, void of substantiating charges, proof of discrimination, and intent.

Desegregation of higher education as it seeks to address Black institutions must instead deal with methods of enhancing these institutions and redistributing programs and funds necessary to overcome and compensate for years of discriminatory funding and neglect on the part of State legislative bodies. Moreover, desegregation efforts should be geared toward enhancement of equal educational opportunities for constituents served by State institutions. It is recommended that,

3.0. Additional other race enrollment in Black colleges required through desegregation efforts should not produce a decrease in the number of Blacks normally enrolled, but should result in a total increase in institutional enrollment. Federal and State agencies should carefully monitor the desegregation process to determine the effect on Black enrollment and attainment levels in the Adams States and other States to which desegregation edicts are leveled, and to prevent erosion of Black enrollment.

In States formerly operating de jure systems of higher education which have been required to eliminate program duplication between predominantly Black and white institutions, it is recommended that,

4.0. An extensive informational system for high school and college counselors and lay persons be devised to acquaint students with program changes, and to make efforts aimed at matching students with programs of interest at State schools.

B. Federal Policies Impacting Diversity

The Federal government has evidenced a commitment to diversity through legislative, judicial and executive actions. The Higher Education Act of 1965 illustrates two models applicable in promoting student and institutional diversity. One involves student financial aid programs based on need (Title IV), and is related to national efforts to promote equality of educational opportunity. The second involves direct institutional aid to developing institutions based on their potential for greater contribution to the Nation's higher education resources and service to low-income students (Title III). The Developing Institutions program is related to the national goals of supporting the development of a quality education system and promoting a diversified system of postsecondary education as to purpose and control.*

Financial Aid Impact. Since 1965, the Federal government has played an increasingly larger role in aiding needy students in financing their college education. Throughout the 1970's, numerous changes have been implemented in the thrusts and types of financial aid approaches used to make higher education a reality for all who seek it. Presently Federal financial aid encompasses five basic programs at the undergraduate level: the Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant Program (SEOG), College Work-Study Program (CWS), and National Direct Student Loan Program (NDSL), popularly known as the three campus based Federal programs; the Basic Educational Opportunity Grant Program (BEOG), a portable grant which goes directly to students; and the Guaranteed Student Loan Program (GSL) which enables students to borrow from eligible lenders at low interest rates to meet educational expenses. Given the large pool of students eligible for these grants and loans, the impact of Federal aid policies on student distribution and on institutions enrolling large numbers of student recipients should be considered as they relate to student and institutional diversity.

The BEOG program is the largest funded program and impacts the largest number of students. The FY 1978 appropriation for BEOG was $2.168 billion. During this award period, approximately 2.4 million students received awards ranging up to $1,600 (USDHEW/OE, Federal Register, January 25, 1979).

The philosophy behind portable BEOG grants is twofold: (1) to foster the idea that the money necessary to attend college is an entitlement, and that students may in fact shop around for a college; and (2) that one way to make institutions more responsive to students is to put the purchasing power in the hands of students thereby fostering a free market approach in higher education. Thus, financial aid as evidenced through the BEOG program is tied into fostering a diversity concept whereby the student consumer supports diverse institutions by applying his options and purchasing power in attending an institution most compatible with his/her needs and interests.

Where BEOG monies are portable and amounts to students determined by the appropriate Federal agency, the final responsibility for administration and provision for counseling and consumer information resides with the institution itself. Consequently, institutions catering to largely low-income groups of students, as do the HBC's, must assume greater responsibilities in administering large BEOG accounts with no appreciable dollar remuneration from Federal sources. Where Federal regulations stipulate an administrative allowance of $10 per year for each student receiving a Basic Grant, funds have not been appropriated by Congress for this purpose. Hence, Federal financial aid policies tend to have an adverse affect on institutions with evidenced commitment to access for low-income students.

---

*Other titles of the HEA contribute to these goals: Title V-B, training for higher education personnel; Title VI-A, improvement of undergraduate instructional equipment; Title II-A, strengthening of postsecondary library resources; Title VII, construction and academic facilities.

Moreover, the BEOG program has a half-cost provision which has caused it to be equated to a double-edged sword favoring both need-based access to low-cost institutions and defending the high-cost private sector (Kahn, 1978, p. 15). In FY 1978, average awards to students at public institutions were approximately $800 compared to an average grant of $1,050 at private institutions (Congressional Budget Office, 1978, p. 23).

The lower tuition level sustained makes low-cost public institutions more attractive to low-income students, and high-cost more selective institutions more attractive to higher income students and those able to bear the burden of larger college costs. Since the program tends to aid the higher-priced institutions in attracting middle-income and economically disadvantaged students, it indirectly maintains a diverse cadre of students in higher priced institutions. In reality, however, the half-cost provision limits the number of institutional options available to the low-income student.

This is most evident when the distribution of minority students on BEOG's by institutional type is considered. Atelsek and Gomberg (1977, p. 7) found that minority students (Black and Hispanics) comprise a larger proportion of BEOG recipients at public institutions (46 percent) than at private institutions (32 percent). Moreover, the distribution of Blacks receiving BEOG's at public institutions is highest at the less selective two-year institutions (34.2 percent), and decreases through the four-year (31.8 percent) and university level institutions (23.8 percent). (Ibid, p. 16)

Data on actual cause and effect of financial aid policies on student distribution are limited. Simulation models on the effects of alternative financial aid policies however bear out differential enrollment impact for six categories of institutions (Carroll et al, 1977). In that financial aid policies have the potential for redirecting the distribution of students, and the availability of financial aid is paramount to low-income student attendance, the effects of financial aid policies should be closely gauged.

Recent legislation expanding the pool of financial aid recipients to include middle-income students will no doubt enlarge financial aid impact on distribution. Since private liberal arts colleges are extremely dependent on tuition and fees for operating capital, and generally have the largest income from Federal sources on a per student basis (Carnes, 1977, pp. 37-38), they stand to benefit most from middle-income student assistance. Moreover, select public and private institutions will benefit generally from having a larger pool of middle-class applicants who are often better prepared and can better afford this type of education than lower income applicants.

Ramifications of middle-income student assistance on student distribution can only be speculated upon. Will this signal a trend whereby the public and lower priced sectors will become the exclusive domain of low-income students? If so, then the cause of diversity will not have been served. The present half-cost provision is perceived as punishing the poor. The American Council on Education (ACE) estimates that approximately 700,000 students are adversely affected by this rule. Therefore, financial aid policies should be adjusted to show greater sensitivity to the needs of low-income groups while providing for their equitable representation in all types of institutions. Furthermore, policies should not disproportionately affect institutions which purposely depress tuition levels in line with their unique missions and the student market to which they cater.

Institutions such as HBC's generally maintain lower tuition levels due in part to the characteristics of their largely low-income student bodies and in order to attract students (Bowles and DeCosta, 1971, p. 179; Jones and Weathersby in Willie, 1978, pp. 127-128). In 1975-76, the average tuition rate for United Negro College Fund (UNCF) member colleges was roughly two-thirds the national average for other private four-year colleges (UNCF, 1977, p. 35). Additionally, a large portion of UNCF college budgets is directly drawn from tuition dollars as opposed to endowment funds and other sources of support.

Kahn (1978), raises the issue of the interrelationship of greater Federal student subsidy and rising tuition rates. Rises in BEOG funding have been justified to reflect the increases in college costs since 1972. Kahn, however, poses the question of whether the reverse has been true. That is, have tuition costs grown in relationship to the availability of greater BEOG average grant awards? "There is a strong fear . . . that frequent increases in the BEOG maximum will only encourage increases in tuition, thereby defeating the program's purpose of lowering economic barriers to postsecondary education and increasing federal support for colleges and universities that enroll large numbers of BEOG recipients." (Ibid, p. 14) Within this rationale, it can be surmised that institutions with depressed tuition levels, such as HBC's, are not capitalizing adequately on Federal student subsidies; however, it may not be within their interests or the interests of their student bodies to do otherwise.

Many of the problems faced by Black colleges are related to their mission in the education and commitment to Black and poor people. Present financial aid legislation and requlations do not go far enough in controlling for the disproportionate impact of financial policies on these institutions and targeting grant programs to institutions with the largest number of needy students.

Funds for campus based programs (SEOG, CWS and NDSL) are allotted to States on the basis of statutory formulas which are different for the three campus-based programs. Moreover, these formulas have enrollment as their primary criteria and do not parallel the actual financial need in a State (USDHEW/OE, Federal Register, November 8, 1978, p. 52132).

Presently, a 4 percent allowance is available to institutions for administering campus-based Federal programs. This amount must be deducted from monies available to schools for their campus based programs. Needed are more adequate allowances which do not subtract from the monies earmarked for student use.

Since financial aid programs tend to impact student diversity and affect the financial resources of institutions, it is recommended that,

5.0. Financial aid policies reflect a sensitivity to the unique roles and missions of institutions. It may be necessary to use a variety of financial aid formulas to adjust for these differences across institutions and student types so as not to put any group of students or institutions in an unfavorable position. Where BEOG half-cost provisions penalize poorer students in their efforts to finance an education, they should be waived.

So that funds for campus based programs are targeted to regions and institutions with neediest students, it is recommended that,

6.0. Federal funds for campus based programs be apportioned to States not on the basis of the relative number of persons enrolled in higher education, but on the proportion of low-income students enrolled.

To counteract the additional administrative burdens placed on institutions serving largely low-income student populations, it is recommended that,

7.0. Administrative allowances be appropriated to institutions per student receiving Basic Grants and that similar arrangements be made for campus based Federal financial aid programs. This allowance should be in addition to, rather than part of, allocations for student needs.

Additionally, in that large Federal financial aid accounts create additional management and accounting responsibilities for institutions, it is recommended that,

8.0. Federal sources assist institutions with large financial aid accounts to institute management and accounting systems and provide on-site technical assistance for this purpose.

Direct Institutional Aid. Historically, responsibilities related to education have been delegated to the States and private sources. However, Federal support to institutions for development of curricula and services germane to the national interests has an equally long tradition and history. The creation and funding of the military and land-grant institutions are exemplary of Federal support and encouragement of diversity in higher education. Grants for R and D purposes is one way the government abets the institutions categorically described as research universities. Without Federal subsidy of this type, the research thrusts of these institutions in support of the national research effort could not continue at present levels. The documented role played by HBC's in the education of the Nation's Black and poor populations warrants an equally needed level of Federal support in furtherance of this mission.

The Developing Institutions Program, Title III of the HEA of 1965, represents an effort to aid the less visible institutions outside of the mainstream of postsecondary institutions, and to aid and recognize the useful role for institutions which serve large numbers of low-income and minority students in fulfilling Federal educational priorities. Through Title III, the availability of pluralistic structures of education and the enhancement of institutions responsive to the needs of low-income and minority students was deemed an appropriate mechanism for achieving the Federal goals of access, equity and excellence in higher education.

The Title III program has been a tremendous boost to developing institutions in helping to overcome handicaps and develop programs and services necessary to provide a quality education to their student bodies. In FY 1977, 419 institutions benefited from the $120 million authorized for Title III. Consistent with the intent of the legislation, 82 of the HBC's qualified as "developing" and participated in the program in 1975. Collectively, they received less than half of the funds, 46 percent or $54.4 million (USDHEW, Office of Planning, Budgeting and Evaluation, 1977, p. 290). In addition to the 46 percent of funds going to the HBC's, approximately 8 and 6 percent went to institutions in which Native-Americans and Spanish-speaking students predominate, respectively. Over ten years after the initiation of the first program geared primarily for institutions which serve a disproportionately large segment of the Nation's poor and minority populations, only 60 percent of program funds are going to Black and other minority institutions. In increasing numbers, predominantly white institutions are beginning to edge in for a share.

Two facts should be kept in mind as limited Title III funds become available to an expanding pool of institutions:

(1) Funding levels to developing institutions can in no way be compared to the dollars spent on financial aid to needy students or in R and D grants to research universities.

(2) HBC's lack diversity in source of Federal grants. At present, Title III is in fact the primary Federal support program for Black colleges.

Despite the infusion of aid to institutions characterized as being out of the mainstream of higher education, the program suffers from its own limiting criteria and focus. Title III has never been viewed as a mechanism for sustaining diversity in U. S. higher education. Instead, it was conceived as a temporary gesture to give institutions a necessary boost to achieve mainstream status. The hoped for outcome was a rise in the level of educational quality, program availability, student services and faculty development in recipient institutions, and eventually equal partnership in the mythical "mainstream" of higher education.

Critics of Title III seek a timely graduation of institutions from this program (U.S. General Accounting Office, 1979). Others such as Froomkin (1978, p. 36) see measures for maintaining diversified institutions as counteractive to the accrual of benefits to stronger institutions which could gain from the closing of weaker ones. Froomkin's position is to support the flagship institutions making sure that they remain innovative in their fields of leadership. Arguments such as these center around maintenance of the status quo and fail to consider or acknowledge the impact of institutionalized racism in our society which has stunted the growth and advancement of minority institutions whose interests and missions counteract racial and socioeconomic injustices.

Lacking is a sensitivity to the cumulative impact of years of differential funding afforded developing institutions such as Black colleges. Lacking is a strong understanding of the role these institutions have played and can continue to play in the affirmative action goals of the Nation. Lacking is an acknowledgement that the quality of service these institutions render to their low-income minority clientele is not necessarily replicated in other types of institutions. Further, this primary commitment to a particular racial group characteristic of a limited socioeconomic status does not result in greater prestige and acknowledgement of leadership roles in affirmative action or success with the less prepared student, growing endowment or development efforts, and lucrative Federal and private grants.

Needed is the acceptance of the concept of entitlement for schools which contribute significantly to the national goals of access and equity, and which prepare minorities for academic, professional and vocational roles in our society. In real terms, this emphasis is as important to the national good as the roles played by science and research, military training, and agricultural advancement institutions. Institutions performing the well-documented role which HBC's play require a larger base of Federal support than Title III as presently structured can directly offer, or that Title IV (student financial aid) can indirectly offer. At best, Title III can serve to help institutions attain a baseline of excellence and viability. This is a level which the mainstream institutions surpassed long ago and which accounts for the superior resources and capabilities possessed by these institutions today.

Given the present framework of Title III, it alone cannot successfully bring minority institutions into the mainstream, counteract years of discriminatory funding, and target institutions with a primary commitment to the education of Black students. Measures must be undertaken to restrict the ever widening pool of recipients to the set of minority institutions for which the original legislation was intented*--the institutions which have historically and presently undertaken a unique responsibility and task which other institutions either could not or would not undertake.

Black institutions represent the few positive outgrowths of institutionalized racism in this country. Their experiences and development have been unique. They therefore warrant unique solutions. It is recommended that,

9.0. Title III of the Higher Education Act be made explicitly for the benefit of Black colleges and universities.

---

*According to Cobb (1977, Chapter II), the impetus for Title III grew out of a combination of events: the social unrest of the 1960's; issues involving the upgrading of Black colleges; and the tireless championing of Black educators and other groups concerned with expanding opportunities for Blacks in higher education. With respect to the intended recipients, Cobb reports that Congresswoman Edith Green of Oregon, who introduced the proposed Title III legislation, felt that the legislation specifically referred to the Black colleges in the South. Expediency and pressure from other group interests eventually resulted in the use of the term "developing institutions" to characterize grant recipients. The final wording in the legislation has contributed to much of the subsequent confusion regarding Title III (e.g., when does an institution reach "developed" status?), and diluted theintent of the legislation in focusing on minority institutions.

Concomitant with this effort should be the development of a broad funding base for these institutions. Presently, many Black institutions are stymied in their efforts to garner wider sources of support due to the absence of a strong and focused mission acknowledging their primacy in a given field. Due to limited resources, it is difficult for them to compete for funds and grants with the mainstream institutions. Hence, it is recommended that,

10.0. Title III funds should be used to help institutions plan for and develop programs to further a well defined mission and purpose. In so doing, institutions could begin to impact the appropriate funding sources concordant with this focus.

Initiatives such as these will help Black institutions compete more successfully for a wider range of Federal and private sources of funds including R and D grants.

Beneficiaries of grants for R and D efforts have primarily been the large research universities. A report from fifteen research university presidents* (1978) attests to the extraordinarily productive and profitable nature of the relationship between the government and these types of institutions in furtherance of their research missions.

In FY 1976 and transition quarter, 100 institutions alone received over 80 percent of Federal funds allotted for the following science-related activities (See Appendix C, Table C-1):

- academic science
- research and development
- fellowships, traineeships, and grants
- facilities and equipment for instruction in the sciences and engineering.

In the area of general support to science, Federal funds were slightly more equitably distributed with 100 institutions receiving almost two-thirds of the funds obligated for this purpose, including a handful of HBC's.

---

*The publication represented the opinions of chief administrators from the following universities: Harvard, Princeton, Yale, California Institute of Technology, University of Illinois, Cornell, University of Michigan, University of North Carolina, Stanford, University of Minnesota, Columbia, University of California, University of Wisconsin, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and University of Chicago.

Traditionally, the HBC's have not been recipients of this form of aid. The Federal Interagency Committee on Education (FICE) reported 40 and 43 percent of Federal funds in FY 1972 and 1973, respectively, received by all colleges and universities, were for science related R and D grants (no date, p. 4). Of Federal funds received by Black colleges, R and D grants represented only 10 percent and 12 percent, respectively, for those years. By FY 1977, Federal funds for R and D activities had risen to 15 percent of Federal funds to Black colleges; however, Federal funds to all colleges and universities for these activities increased to 52 percent of Federal funds received. (See Appendix C, Table C-2) Despite some change in distribution of Federal funds to Black colleges, a maldistribution persists. These institutions continue to be placed in a catch-up position without equitable catch-up aid or opportunities.

Support for R and D activities has manifold implications for institutions in terms of expanded equipment and facilities, growth of graduate and professional programs and services, quality of faculty, and selectivity of students. Where Black institutions experience limited participation in this funding arena, they are denied the full opportunities for horizontal and vertical growth and specialization which in turn ensure wider sources of support and greater opportunities for their students to engage in science-related and research areas of study.

The FY 1969 FICE study of Federal support to Black colleges (1971) concluded that an imbalance existed in funding policies originating from the mission-oriented nature of many Federal agencies (e.g. scientific development) which was inconsistent with the characteristics of most Black colleges. Also, legal restraints were cited by FICE in the case where States designated only 1862 land-grant institutions as recipients of Federal (Department of Agriculture) and State matching funds, thereby excluding the 1890 Black land-grant schools.

Subsequent FICE publications covering the fiscal years 1972 through 1977 reported growths in Federal funds to Black institutions from 2.9 percent of total funds to all colleges in 1969 to a high of 5.7 percent in FY 1974 and slight decreases in later years. (See Appendix C, Tables C-3 through C-9 for Federal support to all institutions and Black colleges by agency for FY 1972-1977.) Despite the FICE findings and recommendations regarding greater disbursement of funds across agencies, many of the 1969 findings remained relatively similar to later findings. The majority of Federal monies to Black colleges continued to come from limited government sources (primarily OE and human resource agencies), and not distributed across all government agencies. Black institutions receiving sizable non-OE Federal grants were typically the larger institutions offering higher degrees and having professional schools. In short, only those Black schools most closely akin to the large research universities appear to compete successfully for a wide scope of Federal agency funds.

Little consideration in Federal funding is given to the special purpose missions of the bulk of HBC's outside of OE's Title III program, or to how broader funding can more quickly facilitate mainstream status of the HBC's and expand academic and vocational experiences for Black students. Little consideration seems evident in Federal policy to account for the unique characteristics of Black colleges -- for example, the low-income status of the majority of their students, small endowments related to the lower earning potential of Black Americans which typify their graduates, the characteristics of their faculties largely related to the undergraduate teaching nature of the HBC's; general lack of recognition and prestige in the wider education community; and differential funding practices over time.

Despite Federal policy aimed at expanding educational opportunities for low-income and minority students, Federal agencies with missions concordant with the work of Black colleges (e.g., teacher training and compensatory education) have been largely unresponsive in funding Black colleges and using them as resources. For example, the National Institute for Education (NIE) whose primary concerns have been in teaching and learning processes, a role concommitant with the teacher training roles of many HBC's, has been conspicuously negligent in funding to HBC's in the past.* In that Black colleges have a headstart on other institutions in training and success with the Black and low-income student, they should serve as models for other institutions. Due to the track record of the Black colleges in educating high risk students in both urban and rural settings, Black colleges should be primary recepticles for Federal programs aimed at expanding access to higher education and for redressing underrepresentation of minority groups in certain vocations.

Every Federal effort should be made to assure a preserve for Black colleges in the diversified grouping of higher education structures. To do so is to ensure a preserve for Black Americans in higher education. This can only be done with full government backing, strong commitment to broad agency funding, and placement of Federal programs within Black institutions. Additionally, measures must be attempted which aid Black institutions in their catch-up efforts and to rectify past injustices.

It is recommended that,

11.0. Efforts to ensure that HBC's are given a fair opportunity to participate in Federal contract and grant programs are enforced and maintained.

The recent Presidential directive (January 17, 1979) to Federal agencies to eliminate barriers to HBC participation in Federal awards is a positive step which should be carefully monitored. FICE data on Federal funding to Black colleges have been sporadic and often difficult to verify in the past. New data-collecting mechanisms should be set in place to ensure that the directive can be effectively monitored and evaluated in terms of its intended impact on Black colleges.

---

*See NIE obligations for FY 1973-77 (Appendix C, Tables C-4 to C-9)

Efforts such as these are aimed at guaranteeing equity for Black colleges in disbursement of Federal agency funds. In areas where Black colleges already possess some level of specialization or unique quality which can be drawn upon in furtherance of the national educational goals, Federal agencies should aim for greater utilization of these institutions and help them upgrade these qualities. It is recommended that,

12.0. Federal agencies with missions paralleling those of the HBC's evidence appreciable increases in funding and placement of programs and activities at these institutions.

12.1. Institutions such as HBC's, with strong success records with high-risk students and exemplary programs in compensatory education and alternate learning styles, become sites for future educational research laboratories.

It is strongly suggested that an NIE national laboratory be placed within one or more of the more outstanding HBC's. Such an effort would not only give credence and national scope to the institution(s), but would provide a source of scholarly training for Black graduate students and researchers, and contribute to the literature of research by Blacks on Blacks sorely lacking in contemporary educational research.

It is further recommended that,

12.2. Federal agencies recognize the special urban missions of many HBC's and utilize these institutions in urban problem solving.

For example, Comprehensive Education and Training Act (CETA) efforts should seek greater utilization of HBC's in training and education efforts. The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) could make greater use of resources in Black colleges in furtherance of HUD projects.

12.3. Government agencies (e.g., Department of Agriculture) take responsibility for past inequities in funding to Black land-grant institutions and begin to address this inequity by increaing funding and implementing special programs aimed at furthering the rural missions of these institutions, and increasing the number of graduates in agriculture-related fields. Further, Black land-grant institutions should be used as sites for Federal laboratories and training stations.

So that HBC's might better serve students through their existing graduate and professional programs, expand the numbers of Blacks in postbaccalaureate education, and compete more favorably for R and D funds, it is recommended that,

13.0. Federal efforts be made to upgrade existing graduate and professional programs at HBC's. Graduate and Professional Opportunity Program funds should target fellowships and program development grants to these institutions.

It is essential that Black colleges play an active role in funneling Blacks into vocations and fields of specialization where Blacks are currently underrepresented. It is recommended that:

14.0. Black colleges, with the aid of Federal, State, and local interests, launch intensive counseling and academic programs for producing more majors in underrepresented areas. Federal loan cancellation programs such as those used for the teaching and health professions should be expanded to service in other fields where Blacks are currently underrepresented, where manpower needs are forecast for the future, and for service in the Black community.

15.0. With government encouragement and support, coordinated efforts between the national testing services and HBC's should be initiated to get more Blacks into the testing industry. NIE, ETS, and ACT sponsorship and alliances with Black graduate schools and special internship programs would be ways of expanding Black involvement in this area.

16.0. Student and faculty exchange programs with research and doctorate-granting universities and with professional schools be intensified.

It is generally conceded that costs of instruction for poorly prepared students exceed that for better prepared students. At present, no provision exists for addressing this problem. Cost of instruction allowances were called for in the 1965 Higher Education Act but were never funded. Funding of this type of provision could provide needed institutional support and enhancement of the quality of instruction in institutions serving large numbers of culturally and socially disadvantaged students. This action would alleviate financial drains presently sustained by Black institutions in this regard, and would free them to use institutional funds in other ways to guarantee their general health. It is recommended that,

17.0. Congress appropriate a cost of education supplement to institutions servicing disproportionately large numbers of high risk and underprepared students to offset additional cost to the institution of remedial and special services required by such students.

Where the previously mentioned strategies offer more immediate help for Black institutions, the concept of endowment plan funding offers a more long-term solution to the health and viability of these institutions.

It has long been recognized that endowment funds provide a continual basis of financial support to institutions and sustain institutions during times of financial distress. Despite this fact, the majority of higher education institutions do not have significant endowment funds. A 1969 study found that 23 percent of all endowment assets were held by five institutions (in Cobb, 1977, p. 108). Characteristic of institutions with relatively little endowment assets are HBC's, and newer and two-year institutions such as the NPBC's. According to an OE Task Force Report, Title III institutions possess slightly more than 1 percent of total endowment funds of all colleges (USDHEW/OE, 1977, p. 6). The UNCF annual survey of member institutions lists mean endowments of its 39 undergraduate institutions as being 37 percent of the mean for private colleges nationally (1977, p. 33). Since level of endowment gifts is related to economic status of alumni, institutions serving Black and predominantly low-income students must look beyond alumni for this source of financial stability. Hence, Federal support for endowment building is a logical alternative.

Patterson (1976) has developed a model for an endowment funding plan based on private gifts and borrowed money.* The combined gift and loan funds are then invested at a favorable interest spread. Earnings from this investment would enable the institution to repay the loan principal and interest, provide current budget support, and, after the original loan period is satisfied, own the endowment thus providing a continuous flow of revenue.

An OE Task Force related this plan to Title III AIDP Institutions delineating a basic plan as follows:

> In its most fundamental form, the Plan provides that an institution assume responsibility for the raising of a sum of money from private sources (philantropic gifts, alumni giving, etc.). The institution then borrows a multiple of this sum (for example, three times the amount raised) from a private lending institution. The loan would be accompained by a Federal guarantee (optional) with an amortization period of 25 years and an agreement that payment of the principal would not begin until the 16th year of the loan period. The institution would also receive a Federal grant equivalent to approximately two years of interest payments which could be then invested with the institutionally raised funds and with the borrowed money to form an endowment unit of significant size. (USDHEW/OE, 1977, p. 9).

---

*For a more indepth explanation of the model, the reader is referred to The College Endowment Funding Plan, American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., 1976.

It is generally felt that embracing this approach would represent a creative response to fund replacement required for many Title III institutions; however, the concept transcends even those institutions, and represents a viable long-term solution to less endowed institutions such as the HBC's. It also represents a broadening of financial resources for these schools and one way of escaping the dependency on public funds.

Therefore it is recommended that,

18.0. Institutional development be given a high priority in Federal initiatives involving Black colleges and that development efforts be supported by Federal, State and private sources. The Patterson plan is exemplary of this type of effort.

The question asked in Federal circles regarding the funding policy toward Black institutions is: Is the return on expenditures in terms of the national objective worth the money spent? This is really the crux of the policy determination toward Federal support of Black higher education.

Two considerations are at hand: (1) the cost of replacement were these institutions not to exist; and (2) how these institutions pay off in terms of meeting national goals of universal access and opportunity/options for students of varying interests and abilities. The issue of access cannot be refuted. HBC's are characterized by open enrollment or minimal admissions criteria. Their high rate of retention and attainment attest to their success in producing graduates who would not normally (through other channels) have obtained a college education. Until other institutions can guarantee this level of access coupled with completion rates, the relative worth of Black institutions should remain unquestioned.

What has been lacking in traditional evaluations of institutional effectiveness is the "value added" capability of institutions. That is, what does the institution contribute in terms of process to the inputs (incoming students) and outputs (graduates) it generates? Traditional evaluations of institutional worth center on quality of inputs, measured in terms of high school rank, grade point averages (GPA), and national standardized test scores, and quality of outputs, measured in terms of Graduate Record Examination (GRE) scores, numbers of graduates in graduate and professional schools, and graduate income. Measures of process or factors impacting the learning environment generally used are faculty attainment and salaries, library volumes, student/faculty ratio and the like. These traditional measures are generally interrelated and do not speak to the issue of "value added" to the education process. For example, highly selective institutions begin with high quality inputs (students with high college placement scores, from higher income brackets and good secondary schools). Hence, it is a simple matter to produce high quality outputs (students with high GRE's, capable of attending graduate and professional schools, and attaining high income levels). For schools such as HBC's which start with many lower quality inputs, the "value added" capability must be greater to produce any output. This capability has not been sufficiently recognized nor has it been effectively exploited by Black higher education as an actual cost incurred and a service characteristic of HBC's.

The cost incurred in this process is paid through faculty dedication and a basic institutional commitment to the potential of the high risk and culturally different student. For the student beginning his college career with inadequate secondary training and supports, a "catch-up" phase is necessary. Four years of undergraduate training may not be totally sufficient to place this student on par with the more affluent or advantaged student and accurately gauge actual institutional output. For the minority and low-income student, the break-even period may not be realized immediately. Rather, it may not surface until years after graduation. It is this lag period coupled with the implications of the institutional "value added" component which have not been adequately addressed in educational literature, by national associations, the Federal government, or accrediting concerns when evaluating institutional effectiveness and value.

The role of educating academically and financially disadvantaged students should not be construed as an inferior one in the higher education community, but should be viewed as a mission of worth. To dispell these notions and embrace the "value added" contribution of institutions, it is recommended that,

19.0. Criteria for institutional evaluation should encompass educational goals and methodologies geared toward encouraging and maintaining diverse approaches to higher education of students who have been undereducated at lower levels.

According to Robinson (in Willie and Edmonds, 1978, p. 158):

> The truth of the matter is that far from being 'disaster areas' as two Harvard scholars have charged, black colleges have been the most productive institutions in America, given their resources, their personnel, and the general attitude of the public toward them. It seems, however, a paradox that these disaster areas have produced the overwhelming majority of black leadership in America today: about 85 percent of black elected officials, and over 80 percent of the black military officers.

It is time that the importance of Black colleges is understood and acknowledged. HBC's have produced, and produced at an above average level of quality, given financial and societal restraints. To deny these institutions the benefit of reward in the face of achievement, and subsidy in the face of potential loss of their valuable resources and services, is incompatible with traditional American thought and policy. Thus, the HBC's play an important role and contribute their share to national priorities. Until suitable alternatives are evident, Federal efforts should support them in every way possible.

VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Diversity in higher education is a positive factor when it promotes maximum student choices in the type, cost, location, level, and control of institutions available. Diversity is a negative characteristic of the postsecondary structure when it relegates certain groups and student types to limited areas of the structure where opportunities for success and attainment are restricted. The existence of different types of institutions does not necessarily guarantee student access to all types of institutions. Rather, the benefit of contrasting institutions rests in the provision of multiple opportunities for access to higher education.

Until better solutions are found to educating a mass populace, diversity must be made to work in the best interest of all students and particularly minority students who have been traditionally underrepresented in higher education. For these groups, possession of a higher degree represents better chances for full participation in the benefits of American life.

Making the benefits of diversity work for Blacks and other minority groups involves rigorous efforts toward maximizing all points of access. It also involves increasing the odds for retention and attainment. The data provided in the preceeding chapters indicate that Blacks and low-income students are not equally distributed across the full spectrum of educational institutions, nor are they equally successful in different educational institutions.

Blacks tend to be clustered in two-year and less prestigious institutions and underrepresented in the more selective institutions and institutions offering the widest choice of curricula and degrees. Greater Black participation in the selective institutions and those with the greatest financial and academic resources is one way of maximizing the benefits of diversity. Another method is by promoting and enhancing the institutions where the highest concentrations of Blacks are found and the greatest supports and sensitivities are evident--in the predominantly and historically Black colleges.

For Blacks and many low-income students, the benefits of diversity are pronounced through the existence of HBC's. These institutions provide meaningful points of access and often better odds for retention and attainment for Blacks than are currently evident in other institutions with different interests. These colleges make distinctive contributions not only to their respective student groups, but provide cultural and educational support to the wider Black community. In so doing, they enhance the fabric and scope of life for many Blacks, while contributing to an overall cultural and educational diversity in American higher education.

The job of providing access and diversified options is far from complete. Much more can be done with respect to enhancement of Black colleges and further expansion of opportunity options for Blacks in all structures of higher education. The rise of non-traditional institutions in recent years attests to the fact that the need for diversity continues, and diversity must be broadened if universal access is to be achieved. Added to this thrust must be a greater responsiveness from non-Black institutions in the job of educating all Americans. Required are vigorous efforts on the national level to address past and current inequities sustained by Black and other institutions where large numbers of Black and low-income students are found.

This paper addresses many concerns related to the distribution of Black Americans in higher education. It sets forth a framework for the origins and continual necessity for special interest institutions within the overall structure of postsecondary education. A description of the historically Black colleges and universities and their ongoing role in satisfying the educational and cultural needs of Black students provides information upon which local, State, and national policy makers may make knowledgeable decisions about the direction of higher education policy affecting these institutions and their students. Further, this report attempts to elevate the consciousness of the public to the benefits of institutional diversity, an essential component of a democratic educational structure. Recommendations are offered as possible solutions for assuring access and equity for Blacks and low-income students in higher education.

REFERENCES

"Alumni Gifts to Private Black Colleges Jump 339.7 Percent," Equal Opportunity in Higher Education, (The Biweekly Newsletter on Title IX and Civil Rights Compliance), Washington, D.C.: Capitol Publications, January 30, 1978.

American Council on Education, Teaching Faculty in Academe: 1972-73, Research Report, Vol. 8, No. 2.

Astin, A.W. and Lee, C.B.T., The Invisible Colleges, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972.

Astin, A., Preventing Students from Dropping Out, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Astin, H.S. and Cross, P., Characteristics of Entering Freshmen in Predominantly Black and Predominantly White Institutions: A Normative Report, Higher Education Research Institute, November 1977.

Atelsek, F. and Gomberg, I., Estimated Number of Student Aid Recipients 1976- 77, American Council on Education, Higher Education Panel Reports (No. 36), September 1977.

Bacon, Arthur L., "Research in Traditionally Black Schools," in Roosevelt Johnson, Black Scholars in Higher Education in the '70's, Columbus, Ohio: ECCA Publications, 1974.

Baker, L., I'm Radcliffe! Fly Me!, New York: Macmillan Publishing Company 1976.

Bisconti, A.S., Low Income Students in College and Careers (Special Topic Series No. 2), Pennsylvania: CPC Foundation, 1978 (P. O. Box 2263, Bethlehem, PA 18001).

"Black Colleges Have Important Role to Play, House Panel Told," Equal Opportunity in Higher Education, Washington, D.C., Capitol Publications, October 9, 1978.

Boas, L.S., Women's Education Begins, Norton, Massachusetts: Wheaton College Press, 1935.

Bowles, Frank and De Costa, Frank A., Between Two Worlds, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Bowles, Samuel and Gintis, Herbert, Schooling in Capitalistic America, Education Reform and the Contradictions of Economic Life, New York: Basic Books, 1976.

Brubacher, John Seiler, and Rudy, Willis, Higher Education in Transition: A History of American Colleges and Universities 1936-1968, New York: Harper and Row, 1968.

Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, A Classification of Institutions of Higher Education, Berkeley: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1976 (revised edition).

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, The States and Higher Education, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.

Carnes, Bruce, A Profile of Private Liberal Arts Colleges, USDHEW, Bureau of Higher and Continuing Education (HEW Publication No. (OE) 77-17007), Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1977 (Stock No. 017-080-01791-1).

Carroll, Stephen J., Mori, Bryant M., Relles, Daniel A., Weinschrott, David, J., The Enrollment Effects of Federal Student Aid Policies, Prepared for DHEW and Lilly Endowment, Inc., Santa Monica, California Rand, June, 1977.

Clayton, B., Some Characteristics of the Historically Black Colleges: A Collection of Data from the American College Testing Program's Institutional Data Questionnaire, (unpublished manuscript) prepared for the National Advisory Committee on Black Higher Education and Black Colleges and Universities, 1978.

Cobb, Henry (Southern University, Baton Rouge), Report on an Examination of the Developing Institutions Program, USDHEW/OE Bureau of Higher and Continuing Education, September 1977.

College Board, Mexican Americans In School: A Decade of Change, Princeton: College Board, 1979.

Comptroller General of the United States: Report to the Congress of the United States, Problems and Outlook of Small Private Liberal Arts Colleges. U.S. General Accounting Office, August 25, 1978.

Congressional Budget Office, Federal Assistance for Postsecondary Education: Options for FY 1979. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, May, 1978.

Conrad, C. and Cosand, J., The Implications of Federal Education Policy, USDHEW, ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 1, 1976.

Davis, J. and Kirschner, A.H., The Ways and Means: A Study of the Needs and Resources of Students Enrolled in United Negro College Fund Member Institutions, (Research Report Vol II, No. 1), United Negro College Fund (UNCF), June 1977.

DuBois, W.E.B. and Dill, A.G., The College-Bred Negro American, Atlanta University Publications (No. 15), The Atlanta University Press, 1910.

Federal Interagency Committee on Education (FICE), *Federal Agencies and Black Colleges FY 1971*, (USDHEW Publication No. OE 73-01300) Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973 (Stock No. 1780-01120).

Federal Agencies and Black Colleges FY 1972 and FY 1973, (No Date) bound manuscript.

"Federal Agencies and Black Colleges FY 1974," *FICE Report*, Vol 3, No. 2, July 1976.

"Federal Agencies and Black Colleges FY 1975," *FICE Report*, Vol. 4, No. 2, December 1977. (In draft form)

"Federal Agencies and Black Colleges FY 1976 and 1977," *FICE Report*, Vol. 6, No. 2, June, 1979.

"Freshmen Enrollment at Black Colleges Rises Dramatically," *Higher Education Daily*, (the independent daily news service for administrators in postsecondary education), Vol. 6, No. 132, Washington, D.C.: Capitol Publications, July 10, 1978.

Froomkin, Joseph, *Needed: A New Federal Policy for Higher Education*, Institute for Educational Leadership, The George Washington University, Washington, D.C., 1978.

Galambos, Eva C., *Racial Composition of Faculties in Public Colleges and Universities of the South*, Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1979.

General Accounting Office, Comptroller General of the United States, *The Federal Program to Strengthen Developing Institutions of Higher Education Lacks Direction*, HRD-78-170, February 1979.

Gleazer, E.J., *Project Focus: A Forecast Study of Community Colleges,* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

Greeley, A., *From Backwater to Mainstream*. Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969.

Hall, Laurence, and Associates, *New Colleges for New Students*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.

Hill, J.R., *A Study of Governing Board Members of Historically Black Public Colleges and Universities*, Atlanta: Office for the Advancement of Public Negro Colleges, July, 1978.

Holstrom, E. I., "Higher Education and Social Mobility: A Promise Still Kept," Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association for Higher Education, Chicago, March, 1976.

Holstrom, E. and Bisconti, A.S., *Transfers from Junior to Senior Colleges*, Washington, D.C., American Council on Education, 1974.

Holstrom, E.I., and Knepper, P.R., *Four-year Baccalaureate Completion Rates*, Policy Analysis Service, Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education (no date).

Institute for Services to Education, *A Fact Book on Blacks in Higher Education*, Washington, D.C.: ISE, November 1977.

Kahn, Abdul, "Institutional Price Response to Direct Student Subsidy in Higher Education," working paper submitted to the Assistant Secretary for Education, USDHEW, 1978, (unpublished).

Keeton, M., *Models and Mavericks: A Profile of Private Liberal Arts Colleges*, (Sixth of a series of profiles sponsored by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education), San Francisco: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Kopan, Andrew I, and Walberg, Herbert J., *Rethinking Educational Equity*, Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishers Corp., 1974.

Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service, "The Historically Black Colleges: Prospects and Options for Federal Support," Education and Public Welfare Division, January 17, 1977 (unpublished).

Lynch, Sr. Jean M., *Maximizing Productivity in Thirty-two Black Graduate Schools*, Prepared for U.S. Office of Education, DHEW, Contract No. 300770397, 1979, (unpublished).

Mingle, J., *Black Enrollment in Higher Education: Trends in the Nation and the South*, Atlanta, Georgia: Southern Regional Education Board, 1978.

Minter, W. John and Bowen, Howard R., *Independent Higher Education*, Fourth Annual Report on Financial and Educational Trends in the Independent Sector of American Higher Education, National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, 1978, draft copy.

Mommsen, Kent G., "Black Doctorates in American Higher Education: Some Recommendations," Paper presented to the National Advisory Committee on Black Higher Education and Black Colleges and Universities Atlanta, Georgia, September 11, 1978.

Moton Guide to American Colleges with a Black Heritage, Robert R. Moton Memorial Institute, Washington, D.C., 1973.

______________________________, Robert R. Moton Memorial Institute, Washington, D.C., 1978.

National Advisory Committee on Black Higher Education and Black Colleges and Universities, *First Annual Report 1977: Higher Education Equity: The Crisis of Appearance Versus Reality*. USDHEW/OE/BHCE, 1978.

______________________________, *Access of Black Americans to Higher Education: How Open Is The Door?* USDHEW/OE/BHCE, 1979.

National Advisory Council on Developing Institutions, *Strengthening Developing Institutions, Title III of Higher Education Act of 1965, Annual Report,* March, 1977.

National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education (NAFEO), *State Policy Impediments to Black Colleges*, (unpublished manuscript prepared for the National Advisory Committee on Black Higher Education and Black Colleges and Universities), November 15, 1977.

National Board on Graduate Education, *Minority Group Participation in Graduate Education*, Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences, June, 1976.

National Science Foundation, *Federal Support to Universities, Colleges, and Selected Nonprofit Institutions, Fiscal Year 1976 and Transition Quarter*, Detailed Statistical Tables, Surveys of Science Resources Series, Washington, D.C.: NSF, 77-325.

Office for the Advancement of Public Negro Colleges, *NASULGC-AASCU Advancement*, Vol. VII, No.12, February, 1978.

Patterson, Frederick D., *The College Endowment Funding Plan*, Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1977.

Payne, W., "The Negro Land-Grant Colleges," *Civil Rights Digest*, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Washington, D.C., Spring, 1970.

Pilch, J.,(ed.) *A History of Jewish Education in the United States*, The National Curriculum Research Institute of the American Association for Jewish Education, 1969.

A Report from Fifteen University Presidents, *Research Universities and the National Interest*, New York: Ford Foundation, February, 1978.

Southern Education Foundation, *Ending Discrimination in Higher Education: A Report from Ten States*, Atlanta, November, 1974.

Southern Regional Education Board, "Southern Higher Education and the 1977 State Legislatures," Vol. XXI, No. 1, Fall, 1977.

Southern Regional Educational Board, *Special Financial Needs of Traditional Negro Colleges*, Atlanta: SREB, May, 1969.

Standley, Nancy V., White Students Enrolled in Black Colleges and Universities: Their Attitudes and Perceptions, Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1978.

TACTICS, "Impact Report 1971-1979," Paper presented to the Congressional Sub-Committee on Post Secondary Education, March 28, 1979, Washington, D.C.: TACTICS, unpublished.

Turner, W. and Michael, J., Traditionally Black Institutions of Higher Education: Their Identification and Selected Characteristics, USDHEW, National Center for Education Statistics, Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1978, (Stock No. 017080-01949-3).

United Negro College Fund, Annual Statistical Report, 1974-75, New York: United Negro College Fund.

____________________, Annual Statistical Report of the Member Institutions 1976, New York: United Negro College Fund, 1977.

U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census, Population Characteristics, Series P-20, No. 329. February, 1978.

________________________________, Population Characteristics, Series P-20, No. 321, March, 1978.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, National Center for Education Statistics, Digest of Educational Statistics 1977-78, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1978.

__________________________________, National Center for Education Statistics, Fall Enrollment in Higher Education 1976 Final Report, by Andrew J. Pepin, Washington, D.C.: U.S.Government Printing Office, 1978.

__________________________________, Office of Education, "Endowment Building at Developing Institutions," Washington, D.C.: Report of Task Force, 1977 (unpublished).

_________________________________, Office of Education, Federal Register, November 8, 1978.

_________________________________, Office of Education, Federal Register, January 25, 1979.

________________________________, Office of Education, Office of Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluation, Annual Evaluation Report on Programs Administered by the U.S. Office of Education: Fiscal Year 1977, Washington, D.C.

_______________________________, A Report of the Office of Education Working Conference-Meeting of Deans of Black Graduate Schools, Toward the Maintenance of Quality Graduate Education in Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, October 1976.

Washington, Harold R., "History and Role of Black Law Schools," *Howard Law Journal*, Vol. 18, 1974.

Willie, C.V. and Edmonds, R.R., (eds.), *Black Colleges in America*, New York: Teachers College Press, 1978.

Wright, S., "The Black College in Historical Perspective." In P. Jones (ed.) *Development of Equal Opportunity in Higher education*, (ACT Special Report 22, Transcript of Six Addresses Delivered at the University of Iowa Training Institute for EOP Administrators 1973-74), Iowa City, Iowa: ACT Publications, 1978.

Zwerling, Steven, *Second Best*, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1976.

APPENDIX A

HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES (HBC'S) AND NEWER PREDOMINANTLY BLACK COLLEGES (NPBC'S)

APPENDIX A

102 Historically Black Colleges (which are still predominantly Black) by Region*

(as of Fall 1977)

	Level/Highest Offering[1]	Control
Northeast		
Pennsylvania (2)		
Cheyney State College, Cheyney	M	Public
Lincoln University, Lincoln University	B	Public
North Central		
Ohio (2)		
Central State University, Wilberforce	B	Public
Wilberforce University, Wilberforce	B	Private
South		
Alabama (13)		
Alabama A&M University, Normal	M+	Public
Alabama Lutheran Academy and College, Selma	2	Private
Alabama State University, Montgomery	M+	Public
Daniel Payne College, Birmingham	B	Private
Lawson State Community College, Birmingham	2	Public
Lomax-Hannon Junior College, Greenville	2	Private
Miles College, Birmingham	B,P	Private
Oakwood College, Huntsville	B	Private
S.D. Bishop State Junior College, Mobile	2	Public
Selma University, Selma	B	Private
Stillman College, Tuscaloosa	B	Private
Talladega College, Talladega	B	Private
Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee Institute	M,P	Private
Arkansas (4)		
Arkansas Baptist College, Little Rock	B	Private
Philander Smith College, Little Rock	B	Private
Shorter College, Little Rock	2	Private
University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff, Pine Bluff	B	Public
Delaware (1)		
Delaware State College, Dover	B	Public
District of Columbia (2)		
D.C. Teachers College (Now UDC), Washington, D.C.	B	Public
Howard University, Washington, D.C.	P,D	Private

	Level/Highest Offering[1]	Control
South (cont.)		
Florida (4)		
Bethune-Cookman College, Daytona Beach	B	Private
Edward Waters College, Jacksonville	B	Private
Florida A&M University, Tallahassee	M	Public
Florida Memorial College, Miami	B	Private
Georgia (10)		
Albany State College, Albany	B	Public
Atlanta University, Atlanta	D	Private
Clark College, Atlanta	B	Private
Fort Valley State College, Fort Valley	M	Public
Interdenominational Theological Center, Atlanta	P,D	Private
Morehouse College, Atlanta	B	Private
Morris Brown College, Atlanta	B	Private
Paine College, Augusta	B	Private
Savannah State College, Savannah	M	Public
Spelman College, Atlanta	B	Private
Kentucky (1)		
Kentucky State University, Frankfort	M	Public
Louisiana (6)		
Dillard University, New Orleans	B	Private
Grambling State University, Grambling	M	Public
Southern University A&M College, Baton Rouge	M,P	Public
Southern University in New Orleans, New Orleans	B	Public
Southern University Shreveport-Bossier, Shreveport	2	Public
Xavier University of Louisiana, New Orleans	M	Private
Maryland (4)		
Bowie State College, Bowie	M	Public
Coppin State College, Baltimore	M	Public
Morgan State University, Baltimore	M	Public
University of Maryland-Eastern Shore, Princess Anne	B	Public
Mississippi (11)		
Alcorn State University, Lorman	M	Public
Coahoma Junior College, Clarksdale	2	Public
Jackson State University, Jackson	M+	Public
Mary Holmes College, West Point	2	Private
Mississippi Industrial College, Holly Springs	B	Private
Mississippi Valley State University, Itta Bena	M	Public

	Level/Highest Offering[1]	Control
South (cont.)		
Mississippi (cont.)		
Natchez Junior College, Natchez	2	Private
Prentiss Normal and Industrial Institute, Prentiss	2	Private
Rust College, Holly Springs	B	Private
Tougaloo College, Tougaloo	B	Private
Utica Junior College, Utica	2	Public
North Carolina (11)		
Barber-Scotia College, Concord	B	Private
Bennett College, Columbia	B	Private
Elizabeth City State University, Elizabeth City	B	Public
Fayetteville State University, Fayetteville	B	Public
Johnson C. Smith University, Charlotte	B	Private
Livingstone College, Salisbury	B,P	Private
North Carolina A&T State University, Greensboro	M+	Public
North Carolina Central University, Durham	M,P	Public
Shaw University, Raleigh	B	Private
St. Augustine's College, Raleigh	B	Private
Winston-Salem State University, Winston Salem	B	Public
Oklahoma (1)		
Langston University, Langston	B	Public
South Carolina (8)		
Allen University, Columbia	B	Private
Benedict College, Columbia	B	Private
Claflin College, Orangeburg	B	Private
Clinton Junior College, Rock Hill	2	Private
Friendship Junior College, Rock Hill	2	Private
Morris College, Sumter	B	Private
South Carolina State College, Orangeburg	M	Public
Voorhees College, Denmark	B	Private
Tennessee (7)		
Fisk University, Nashville	M	Private
Knoxville College, Knoxville	B	Private
Lane College, Jackson	B	Private
LeMoyne Owen College, Memphis	B	Private
Meharry Medical College, Nashville	P,D	Private
Morristown College, Morristown	2	Private
Tennessee State University, Nashville	M+	Public

	Level/Highest Offering[1]	Control
South (cont.)		
Texas (9)		
Bishop College, Dallas	B	Private
Huston-Tillotson College, Austin	B	Private
Jarvis Christian College, Hawkins	B	Private
Paul Quinn College, Waco	B	Private
Prairie View A&M University, Prairie View	M+	Public
Southwestern Christian College, Terrell	2	Private
Texas College, Tyler	B	Private
Texas Southern University, Houston	P,D	Public
Wiley College, Marshall	B	Private
Virginia (6)		
Hampton Institute, Hampton	M	Private
Norfolk State College, Norfolk	M	Public
St. Paul's College, Lawrenceville	B	Private
Virginia College, Lynchburg	2	Private
Virginia State College, Petersburg	M	Public
Virginia Union University, Richmond	P	Private
West		
NONE		

---

[1] 2 = 2 but less than 4 years

B = 4 or 5 year Baccalaureate

P = First Professional

M = Master's

M+ = Beyond Master's but less than Doctorate

D = Doctorate

* This listing of HBC's only includes those institutions that are still predominantly Black and for which data are available for inclusion in the Committee's reports. Therefore, the list does not include Simmons University/Bible College (KY) for which no data are available; and Bluefield State College (WV), West Virginia State College (WV) and Lincoln University (MO) which are historically Black institutions but are currently (as of Fall 1976 data) predominantly white and not included in the data analyses done for the Committee reports.

APPENDIX A CONTINUED

NEWER PREDOMINANTLY BLACK COLLEGES (NPBC'S)
(as of Fall 1977)

REGION	LEVEL[1]	CONTROL
NORTHEAST		
Massachusetts (1)		
Roxbury Community College, Roxbury	2	Public
New Jersey (1)		
Essex County College, Newark	2	Public
New York (5)		
City University of New York-Medgar Evers, New York	4	Public
College for Human Services, New York	2	Private
Collegiate Institute, New York	2	Private
Interboro Institute, New York	2	Private
Taylor Business Institute, New York	2	Private
Pennsylvania (1)		
Community College of Philadelphia, Philadelphia	2	Public
NORTH CENTRAL		
Illinois (8)		
Central YMCA Community College, Chicago	2	Private
Chicago State University, Chicago	4	Public
City Colleges of Chicago, Chicago		
Kennedy-King	2	Public
Loop	2	Public
Malcolm X	2	Public
Olive-Harvey	2	Public
Daniel Hale Williams University, Chicago	4	Private
State Community College, East St. Louis	2	Public
Michigan (5)		
Detroit Institute of Technology, Detroit	4	Private
Highland Park Community College, Detroit	2	Public
Lewis Business College, Detroit	2	Private
Shaw College at Detroit, Detroit	4	Private
Wayne County Community College, Detroit	2	Public
Missouri (2)		
Harris Teachers College, St. Louis	4	Public
St. Louis Community College - Forest Park, St. Louis	2	Public

NEWER PREDOMINANTLY BLACK COLLEGES (NPBC'S)
(as of Fall 1977)

REGION	LEVEL[1/]	CONTROL
NORTH CENTRAL CONT.		
Ohio (2)		
Cuyahoga Community College-Metro Campus, Cleveland	2	Public
Payne Theological Seminary, Wilberforce	2	Private
SOUTH		
District of Columbia (3)		
Federal City College,* Washington, D.C.	4	Public
Strayer College, Washington, D.C.	4	Private
Washington Technical Institute,* Washington, D.C.	4	Public
Georgia (1)		
Atlanta Junior College, Atlanta	2	Public
Maryland (2)		
Bay College of Maryland, Baltimore	2	Private
Community College of Baltimore, Baltimore	2	Public
Mississippi (1)		
Ministerial Institute and College, West Point	2	Private
North Carolina (2)		
Durham College, Durham	2	Private
Roanoke-Chowan Technical Institute, Ahoskie	2	Public
South Carolina (2)		
Beaufort Technical Education Center, Beaufort	2	Public
Trident Technical College, Palmer	2	Public
Tennessee (2)		
American Baptist Theological Seminary, Nashville	4	Private
Shelby State Community College, Memphis	2	Public
WEST		
California (3)		
Compton College, Compton	2	Public
Los Angeles Southwest College, Los Angeles	2	Public
Nairobi College, East Palo Alto	2	Private
OUTLYING AREAS		
Virgin Islands (1)		
College of the Virgin Islands, St. Thomas	4	Public

1/ 2 = 2 year/Community Colleges/Technical Institutes
4 = 4 year Colleges

* As of Fall 1977 became a part of the University of the District of Columbia, which also includes D.C. Teachers College, an HBC.

DESIGNATION AS A NPBC IS BASED ON TOTAL AND FULL-TIME ENROLLMENT BEING GREATER THAN 50% BLACK IN FALL 1976.

APPENDIX B

CRITERIA FOR CARNEGIE CLASSIFICATION FOR FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

CRITERIA FOR CARNEGIE CLASSIFICATION
FOR FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

1. Doctorate-Granting Institutions

1.1 Research Universities I. The 50 leading universities in terms of Federal financial support of academic science in at least two of the three academic years, 1972-73, 1973-74, and 1974-75, provided they awarded at least 50 Ph.D.'s (plus M.D.'s if a medical school was on the same campus) in 1973-74.

1.2 Research Universities II. These universities were on the list of the 100 leading institutions in terms of Federal financial support in at least two out of the above three years and awarded at least 50 Ph.D.'s.

1.3 Doctorate-Granting Universities I. These institutions awarded 40 or more Ph.D.'s in at least five fields in 1973-74 (plus M.D.'s if on the same campus) or received at least $3 million in total Federal support in either 1973-74 or 1974-75. No institution is included that granted less than 20 Ph.D.'s (plus M.D.'s if on the same campus) in at least five fields regardless of the amount of Federal financial support it received.

1.4 Doctorate-Granting Universities II. These institutions awarded at least 20 Ph.D.'s in 1973-74 without regard to field, or 10 Ph.D.'s in at least three fields.

2. Comprehensive Universities and Colleges

2.1 Comprehensive Universities and Colleges I. This group includes institutions that offered a liberal arts program as well as several other programs, such as engineering and business administration. Many of them offered master's degrees, but all lacked a doctoral program or had an extremely limited doctoral program. All institutions in this group had at least two professional or occupational programs and enrolled at least 2,000 students in 1976.

2.2 Comprehensive Universities and Colleges II. This list includes state colleges and private colleges that offered a liberal arts program and at least one professional or occupational program, such as teacher training or nursing.

3. Liberal Arts Colleges

3.1 Liberal Arts Colleges I. These colleges scored 1030 or more on a selectivity index developed by Alexander W. Astin or they were included among the 200 leading baccalaureate-granting institutions in terms of numbers of their graduates receiving Ph.D.'s at 40 leading doctorate-granting institutions from 1920 to 1966.

3.2 Liberal Arts Colleges II. These institutions include all the liberal arts colleges that did not meet criteria for inclusion in the first group of liberal arts colleges.

BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES: AN ESSENTIAL COMPONENT OF A DIVERSE SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION

ERRATA SHEET

APPENDIX C

TABLE	AGENCY	CHANGE PERCENTAGE FROM	TO
C-3	Department of Interior	6.9	.69
C-4	Department of Interior	2.2	.22
C-4	National Endowment for the Arts	48.2	4.9
C-5	Atomic Energy Commission	1.7	.17
C-5	Department of Justice	25.6	2.6
C-7	Department of Justice	0	3.8
C-7	Energy Research and Development Administration	.8	.2
C-8	Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	6.1	6.0
C-8	Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration	7.8	.8
C-8	Grand Total	4.9	5.0
C-9	Department of Agriculture	6.50	6.60
C-9	Health Resources Administration	6.90	6.92
C-9	Office of Human Development Services	2.30	2.20
C-9	Environmental Protection Agency	1.60	1.50
C-9	National Endowment for the Humanities	1.90	2.00

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON
BLACK HIGHER EDUCATION AND
BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

APPENDIX C

FEDERAL OBLIGATIONS TO HBC'S

TABLE C-1: FEDERAL OBLIGATIONS TO 100 UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES RECEIVING THE LARGEST AMOUNTS BY TYPE OF ACTIVITY, JULY 1, 1975 TO SEPTEMBER 30, 1976

(Dollars in Thousands)

Federal Obligations by Activity	Funds for 100 Institutions Receiving Largest Obligations	Funds to Top 100 Institutions as % of Funds to All Institutions	Number of HBC's in 100 Institutions Receiving Largest Obligations	Amount to HBC's	% of Amount to HBC's of Funds to Top 100 Institutions
Academic Science	$3,067,503	83.2	0	0	0
Research and Development	2,574,010	84.4	0	0	0
Fellowships, Traineeship and Training Grants	174,776	84.1	0	0	0
General Support to Science	52,503	65.0	9*	3,367	6.4
Facilities and Equipment for Instruction in the Science and Engineering	9,935	84.5	0	0	0
Total, All Activities (includes non-Science)	3,984,666	55.9	1**	121,709	3.1

Source: National Advisory Committee on Black Higher Education and Black Colleges and Universities Staff Compilation of NSF data in Federal Support to Universities, Colleges and Selected Nonprofit Institutions, Fiscal Year 1976 and Transition Quarter, Tables B-7 through B-13.

*Includes: Atlanta University; North Carolina A&T State University; Alabama A&M University; Howard University; Prairie View A&M University; Norfolk State College; Atlanta University Center (a consortium of 5 HBC's including Clark College, Morehouse College, Spelman College, Interdenominational Theological Center, and Atlanta University); Tuskegee Institute; and Tennessee State University.

**Refers to Howard University in Washington, D.C.
Of the total federal funds obligated to Howard, 94.6 percent was for non-science related activities and 98.8 percent was obligated by DHEW.

TABLE C-2: OBLIGATIONS OF FEDERAL AGENCIES TO BLACK AND ALL COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES FOR ACADEMIC SCIENCE AND NON SCIENCE ACTIVITIES, FY 1977

(Dollars in Thousands)

Recipient Institutions	Total Obligations	Academic Science Activities*		Non Science Activities*	
		Amount	Percent of Total	Amount	Percent of Total
Black Institutions	$339,368	$49,668	15	$289,700	85
All Institutions	6,385,017	3,335,250	52	3,049,767	48

*Includes: Research and Development; R&D Plant; Facilities for Instruction in Science and Engineering; Fellowships, Traineeships, Training Grants; General Support for Science and Other Science Activities.

Source: National Advisory Committee on Black Higher Education and Black Colleges and Universities Staff analysis of data from Survey of Federal Support to Universities and Colleges, and Selected Nonprofit Organizations, National Science Foundation in FICE Report, "Federal Agencies and Black Colleges, Fiscal Years 1976 and 1977," Vol. 6, No. 2, 1979, Tables XIX and XX.

TABLE C-3: FEDERAL AMOUNTS OBLIGATED FOR BLACK COLLEGES AND ALL COLLEGES BY AGENCY, FY 1972

(Dollars in Thousands)

Agency	Amount to Black Colleges	Amount to All Colleges	Black Colleges As % Of Total
ACTION	$ 1,043.6	$ 8,231.2	12.7
Agency for International Development	1,500.0	9,388.0	15.9
Atomic Energy Commission	210.4	84,500.0	.3
Department of Agriculture	14,091.9	239,318.0	5.9
Department of Commerce	961.5	23,189.0	4.1
Department of Defense	575.3	207,555.0	.3
Department of HEW	(209,068.0)	(3,231,700.2)	6.5
National Institute of Education	--	--	--
Office of Education	166,058.9	1,474,127.5	11.3
Office of Human Development	11,199.8	31,783.2	35.2
Public Health Service	29,592.1	1,667,109.5	1.8
Social and Rehabilitation Service	2,217.2	58,680.0	3.8
Department of Housing and Urban Development	5,171.0	47,494.6	10.9
Department of Interior	152.6	21,984.5	6.9
Department of Justice	1,610.6	29,837.0	5.4
Department of Labor	3,957.1	57,332.2	6.9
Department of Transportation	240.0	12,729.0	1.9
Environmental Protection Agency	178.3	34,900.0	.5
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	897.0	119,000.0	.8
National Endowment for the Arts	137.0	1,624.9	8.4
National Endowment for the Humanities	1,257.1	20,331.0	6.2
National Science Foundation	9,391.7	445,427.0	2.1
Office of Economic Opportunity	6,513.0	40,650.0	16.0
Veterans Administration	61.9	2,446.0	2.5
GRAND TOTAL	$257,018.0	$4,637,637.6	5.5

Source: National Advisory Committee on Black Higher Education and Black Colleges and Universities Staff analysis of data from Federal Interagency Committee, "Federal Agencies and Black Colleges, Fiscal Years 1972 and 1973."

TABLE C-4: FEDERAL AMOUNTS OBLIGATED FOR BLACK COLLEGES AND ALL COLLEGES BY AGENCY, FY 1973

(Dollars in Thousands)

Agency	Amount to Black Colleges	Amount to All Colleges	Black Colleges As % of Total
ACTION	$ 1,544.5	$ 9,425.0	16.4
Agency for International Development	25.0	9,246.0	.3
Atomic Energy Commission	392.5	82,700.1	.5
Department of Agriculture	17,744.9	262,040.7	6.8
Department of Commerce	745.3	24,787.4	3.0
Department of Defense	1,152.6	249,644.0	.5
Department of HEW	(202,004.7)	(3,097,141.0)	6.5
National Institute of Education	--	38,505.0	-0-
Office of Education	154,926.0	1,318,502.0	11.8
Office of Human Development	12,430.8	36,200.8	34.3
Public Health Service	33,192.7	1,645,431.0	2.0
Social and Rehabilitation Service	1,455.2	58,502.0	2.5
Department of Housing and Urban Development	3,287.9	38,373.0	8.6
Department of Interior	41.4	18,977.8	2.2
Department of Justice	1,154.2	38,127.0	3.0
Department of Labor	5,478.3	42,041.4	13.0
Department of Transportation	331.0	15,452.0	2.1
Environmental Protection Agency	496.3	21,811.0	2.3
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	1,319.0	111,100.0	1.2
National Endowment for the Arts	109.5	2,226.7	48.2
National Endowment for the Humanities	309.5	17,019.0	1.8
National Science Foundation	6,977.4	408,263.0	1.7
Office of Economic Opportunity	6,912.2	40,224.0	17.2
Veterans Administration	68.2	3,968.0	1.7
GRAND TOTAL	$250,094.4	$4,492,567.1	5.6

Source: National Advisory Committee on Black Higher Education and Black Colleges and Universities Staff analysis of data from Federal Interagency Committee, "Federal Agencies and Black Colleges, Fiscal Years 1972 and 1973."

TABLE C-5: TOTAL FEDERAL OBLIGATIONS TO COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, INCLUDING PREDOMINANTLY BLACK INSTITUTIONS, BY AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR 1974

(Dollars in Thousands)

Agency	Amount to Black Colleges	Amount to All Colleges	Black Colleges As % Of Total
ACTION	$ 678	$ 6,500	10.4
Agency for International Development	1,219	18,863	6.5
Atomic Energy Commission	172	99,284	1.7
Department of Agriculture	17,439	260,696	6.7
Department of Commerce	41	29,478	.1
Department of Defense	844	211,236	.4
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	(234,209)	(3,467,428)	6.8
National Institute of Education	--	18,902	-0-
Office of Education	177,876	1,200,977	14.8
Office of Human Development	640	17,798	3.6
Public Health Service	54,994	2,187,181	2.5
Social and Rehabilitation Service	699	42,570	1.6
Department of Housing and Urban Development	3,000	35,855	8.4
Department of Interior	--	23,761	-0-
Department of Justice	1,154	45,000	25.6
Department of Labor	150	7,205	2.1
Department of Transportation	155	12,814	1.2
Environmental Protection Agency	720	30,919	2.3
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	2,277	98,904	2.3
National Endowment for the Arts	180	2,227	8.0
National Endowment for the Humanities	919	28,879	3.2
National Science Foundation	8,166	449,566	1.8
Office of Economic Opportunity	4,576	9,999	45.8
Veterans Administration	80	4,200	1.9
GRAND TOTAL	$275,979	$4,842,814	5.7

Source: National Advisory Committee on Black Higher Education and Black Colleges and Universities Staff analysis of data from Federal Interagency Committee on Education Report, "Federal Agencies and Black Colleges, FY 1974," Volume 3, No. 2. July 1976.

TABLE C-6: TOTAL FEDERAL OBLIGATIONS TO COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, INCLUDING PREDOMINANTLY BLACK INSTITUTIONS, BY AGENCY, FY 1975

(Dollars in Thousands)

Agency	Amount to Black Colleges	Amount to All Colleges	Black Colleges As % Of Total
ACTION	$ 611.3	$ 6,313.0	9.7
Agency for International Development	0	12,442.0	0
Community Services Administration (formerly OEO)	6,000.0	11,500.0	52.2
Department of Agriculture	16,425.0	290,738.0	5.6
Department of Commerce	0	26,445.0	0
Department of Defense	307.0	190,462.0	0.2
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	(205,305.0)	(3,412,281.0)	6.0
National Institute of Education	47.0	13,039.0	0.4
Office of Education	160,658.0	1,316,901.0	12.2
Public Health Service	29,632.0	1,984,383.0	1.5
Social and Rehabilitation Service	0	3,265.0	0
Other HEW	14,968.0	94,693.0	15.8
Department of Housing and Urban Development	671.0	2,337.0	28.7
Department of the Interior	40.0	28,772.0	0.1
Department of Justice	953.0	40,343.0	2.4
Department of Labor	163.0	5,533.0	2.9
Department of Transportation	208.0	20,543.0	1.0
Environmental Protection Agency	566.0	38,811.0	1.5
Energy Research and Development Agency	220.0	124,165.0	0.2
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	2,512.0	108,846.0	2.3
National Endowment for the Arts	58.0	6,668.0	0.9
National Endowment for the Humanities	341.0	32,820.0	1.0
National Science Foundation	5,284.0	490,513.0	1.1
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	0	58.0	0
GRAND TOTAL	$239,664.3	$4,849,590.0	4.9

Source: National Advisory Committee on Black Higher Education and Black Colleges and Universities Staff analysis of data from Federal Interagency Committee on Education Report, "Federal Agencies and Black Colleges, Fiscal Year 1975," Volume 6. No. 1. February, 1979, p.4.

TABLE C-7: FEDERAL OBLIGATIONS TO HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND TO ALL INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION, BY AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR 1976

(Dollars in Thousands)

Agency	Amount to Black Colleges	Amount to All Colleges	Black Colleges As % Of Total
ACTION	$ 499	$ 6,036	8.3
Agency for International Development	926	13,482	6.9
Community Services Administration	1,995	2,846	70.1
Department of Agriculture	17,801	328,614	5.4
Department of Commerce	0	39,086	0
Department of Defense	282	211,868	.1
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	(233,032)	(3,862,088)	6.0
National Institutes of Health	9,823	1,307,363	.8
Health Resource Administration	15,341	470,182	3.3
Health Services Administration	4,745	55,135	8.6
Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration	3,046	157,427	1.9
Center for Disease Control	0	4,665	0
Food and Drug Administration	0	7,777	0
Office of Education	198,094	1,775,564	11.2
National Institute of Education	122	11,111	1.1
Social and Rehabilitation Service	335	8,591	3.9
Other HEW	1,526	64,273	2.4
Department of Housing and Urban Development	423	1,394	30.3
Department of the Interior	124	28,218	.4
Department of Justice	1,322	35,179	0
Department of Labor	177	4,526	3.9
Department of Transportation	199	15,566	1.3
Environmental Protection Agency	634	32,967	1.9
Energy Research and Development Administration	245	143,802	.8
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	2,194	118,886	1.8
National Endowment for the Arts	47	NA	--
National Endowment for the Humanitics	407	35,853	1.1
National Science Foundation	4,572	496,326	.9
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	0	3,285	0
GRAND TOTAL	$264,879	$5,380,022	4.9

Source: National Advisory Committee on Black Higher Education and Black Colleges and Universities Staff analysis of data from Federal Interagency Committee on Education Report, "Federal Agencies and Black Colleges, Fiscal Years 1976 and 1977," Volume 6, No. 2. June 1979.

TABLE C-8: FEDERAL OBLIGATIONS TO HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND TO ALL INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION, BY AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR 1976 TRANSITION QUARTER

(Dollars in Thousands)

Agency	Amount to Black Colleges	Amount to All Colleges	Black Colleges As % Of Total
ACTION	$ 63	$ 782	8.1
Agency for International Development	0	8,890	0
Community Services Administration	0	0	0
Department of Agriculture	5,861	82,923	7.1
Department of Commerce	102	16,939	.6
Department of Defense	109	50,163	.2
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	(77,264)	(1,278,105)	6.1
National Institutes of Health	924	256,204	.4
Health Resources Administration	62	45,476	.1
Health Services Administration	327	26,500	1.2
Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration	182	23,338	7.8
Center for Disease Control	0	0	0
Food and Drug Administration	0	2,073	0
Office of Education	75,474	896,212	8.4
National Institute of Education	0	3,378	0
Social and Rehabilitation Service	0	427	0
Other HEW	295	24,497	1.2
Department of Housing and Urban Development	0	175	0
Department of the Interior	11	10,941	.1
Department of Justice	0	0	0
Department of Labor	0	543	0
Department of Transportation	84	2,987	2.8
Environmental Protection Agency	365	31,828	1.2
Energy Research and Development Administration	133	70,438	.2
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	473	27,586	1.7
National Endowment for the Arts	NA	NA	--
National Endowment for the Humanities	111	9,526	1.2
National Science Foundation	147	115,510	.1
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	0	3,424	0
GRAND TOTAL	$ 84,723	$1,710,760	4.9

Source: National Advisory Committee on Black Higher Education and Black Colleges and Universities Staff analysis of data from Federal Interagency Committee on Education Report, "Federal Agencies and Black Colleges, Fiscal Years 1976 and 1977,"Volume 6, No. 2. June 1979.

TABLE C-9: FEDERAL OBLIGATIONS TO HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND TO ALL INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION, BY AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR 1977

(Dollars in Thousands)

Agency	Amount to Black Colleges	Amount to All Colleges	Black Colleges As % Of Total
ACTION	$ 435	$ 4,950	8.80
Agency for International Development	2,272	24,378	9.30
Community Services Administration	0	246	00
Department of Agriculture	22,859	346,713	6.50
Department of Commerce	5	32,457	.02
Department of Defense	132	267,280	.05
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	(304,416)	(4,712,654)	6.46
National Institutes of Health	12,472	1,439,831	.90
Health Resource Administration	34,384	497,097	6.90
Health Services Administration	4,638	56,789	8.20
Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration	3,566	176,423	2.00
Center for Disease Control	89	13,425	.70
Food and Drug Administration	0	10,406	0
Office of Education	247,780	2,422,463	10.20
National Institute of Education	94	12,866	.70
Office of Human Development Services	1,393	61,926	2.30
Health Care Financing Administration	0	1,246	0
Social Security Administration	0	203	0
Other HEW	0	19,979	0
Department of Housing and Urban Development	211	4,308	4.90
Department of the Interior	42	29,454	.10
Department of Justice	1,200	37,682	3.20
Department of Labor	152	7,169	2.10
Department of Transportation	74	11,228	.70
Environmental Protection Agency	716	46,343	1.60
Energy Research and Development Administration	152	211,547	.07
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	3,031	120,955	2.50
National Endowment for the Arts	46	NA	--
National Endowment for the Humanities	796	40,735	1.90
National Science Foundation	5,271	565,820	.90
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	35	4,711	.70
GRAND TOTAL	$341,845	$6,468,630	5.30

Source: National Advisory Committee on Black Higher Education and Black Colleges and Universities Staff analysis of data from Federal Interagency Committee on Education Report, "Federal Agencies and Black Colleges, Fiscal Years 1976 and 1977," Volume 6, No. 2. June 1979.

☆ U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1979 -631-467/2892